

Before I take my seat, I wish to point out that the other day the Republican chairman said that—

Loyal Americans will not take kindly to any politician willing to run down the President for the sake of personal advantage.

The key words in that sentence are "loyal Americans."

Under this formulation of the Republican chairman—today and for the next few months—any of us who feel obligated to criticize American foreign policy run the risk, of being accused as "disloyal appeasers" and "turnquotes."

But despite that risk the criticism is going to continue. It is our function and responsibility to criticize when there are weaknesses to criticize. And we propose to meet that responsibility. The Democratic Party would be unworthy of its traditions and its responsibility as a party if it did not fulfill the vital function of legitimate criticism, heedless of whether the Governor of New Hampshire may say we are soft on communism or the Senator from Pennsylvania may say it is necessary that I purge myself of the charges of appeasement. These points—these critical issues—will continue to be debated, and I hope much of this debate will be carried on on the floor of the Senate—as well as across the Nation.

Before I sit down, I thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for their kind remarks.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to make a further correction. I again invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that I did not use the phrase that he should purge himself of a suggestion of appeasement. The Senator has my notes before him. The Senator knows that I said—as nearly as I can remember, since the Senator has my notes and is holding on to them—that he should resist the suspicion of appeasement. The Senator has made a very good case in so resisting.

I also add that I mentioned earlier I had made a note—

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator did not say what he says. He is "turn quoting."

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator has my notes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is "turn quoting."

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator has my notes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator said:

It is my hope that they will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator accepts that as what I said?

Mr. KENNEDY. I know the Senator wanted to say what he has said, but he did not say it. He did not say "resist;" he said "relieve."

Mr. SCOTT. "Relieve." I accept what I said. I do not withdraw it. The

Senator may recall that I made some reference to the question whether I said "turn quote" in the first instance.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator does not withdraw the statement?

Mr. SCOTT. I said that there were notes around on some Senator's desk which showed I had that notation. A page, while the Senator from Massachusetts was talking, has found that paper. I leave it with the Senator from Massachusetts, among his mementos. The Senator will see that the word written in my notes is "turn quote."

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator withdraw the statement: "It is my hope that they—" which would include me—"will relieve themselves of the curse of suspicion of appeasement"?

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the Senator, as I said before, I do not feel that the Senator is an appeaser. The Senator, in the statement which he made, claimed that the statements by a newspaperman were taken out of context. If that is correct—and I have no reason to feel that it is not correct—the Senator has, to that degree, removed himself from the application of my remarks with respect to appeasement.

I desire at all times to be fair with the Senator from Massachusetts, but I do not and cannot withdraw from the RECORD the newspaper report which was put into the RECORD not by me but by the Senator from Illinois. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts understands that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I appreciate what the Senator has said, and the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

The statement of Mr. Shoemaker has been added to by the entire statement. I think that the full statement quite clearly shows what I intended to say—my point of view—which was reported, as I said, that way by the Associated Press. Therefore, I am delighted that the Senator has chosen to withdraw his statement.

Mr. SCOTT. Obviously no one questions the courage, the devotion, or the patriotism of the Senator from Massachusetts. My question was pointed up on the newspaper article. We have discussed it thoroughly. The Senator has offered his explanation. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to let it rest with the article and with the Senator's explanation. I assume that that will be satisfactory to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Not quite as satisfactory as it was a moment ago; but in that case I yield the floor.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, in accordance with the order previously entered, until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 4: 3: *Continue steadfastly in prayer.*

Almighty God, Thine is the strength which sustains us, the love which redeems us, the sympathy which comforts us, and the light which leads us.

Grant that we may never lose our faith in Thee, even though we are standing amid what seems to be the defeat of our fondest hopes and dreams.

Help us to believe that the vision of universal peace vouchsafed to our minds and hearts is not too lofty and too wonderful to be fulfilled by Thy divine wisdom and power.

Inspire us with steadfast devotion to continue to pray fervently and to labor faithfully that our disappointed and disheartened humanity may soon find the way of peace and men everywhere shall be mingled in an alchemy of brotherhood.

Humbly we offer our prayer in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1960, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 44. An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### POSTPONING OF ROLLCALLS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls today and tomorrow on the passage of any bills or amendments thereto, or a motion to recommit, be postponed to the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### LOAN OF NAVAL VESSEL TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9465) to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 12, insert:

"Sec. 5. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may, under conditions which he prescribes, lend one submarine to the Government of Canada for a period of not more than five years and may, in his discretion, extend such loan for an additional period of not more than five years. All expenses involved in the activation of this submarine including repairs, alterations, outfitting, and logistic support shall be paid by the Government of Canada. The authority of the President to transfer a submarine under this section terminates on December 31, 1961."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### BIPARTISAN FIASCO

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, after every unbelievable, fantastic, foreign policy blunder by the United States, there is the inevitable call for unity. The collapse of our abortive attempt at appeasement in Paris is no exception.

The greatest aid to Khrushchev is American unity behind the wrong policy. His best friend so far is and has been this bipartisan foreign policy of the United States. Yalta, Potsdam, aid to the Chinese Communists in 1946 to 1949, United States delay at Panmunjom in Korea, Geneva, Camp David, and now Paris were all defended by a chorus of

coverup, censorship, and an appeal to unity and patriotism. This is the surest and quickest road to complete disgrace and defeat of the United States. The late Senator Arthur Vandenberg lost a great opportunity when he joined the bipartisan foreign policy of appeasement and failure. He could have saved Western civilization much anguish by exercising the traditional role of the minority to point out the utter fallacies of Yalta and Potsdam. Through such efforts, the Western peoples could have been alerted to the Communist menace.

Today this bipartisan hayride to destruction must be reversed. We must have a complete change in policy. The Communists must and can be put on the defense. They can be put on the defense by our constant demand that Poland and the captive nations be given their freedom. This bipartisan policy of wasting our strength all over the world, thus pleasing Khrushchev, must be and can be halted. Much of our foreign-aid money should have been and should be spent on making the United States supreme in the air and in space. The greater the mistakes of this so-called bipartisan policy, the greater the clamor for unity behind the same old crowd and the same personnel. We need a change now. Tomorrow will be too late.

### QUESTIONS ON NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of a large number of Members of this body who last Friday asked the President to answer a series of questions on the U-2 incident and related subjects, I deplore and resent the remarks made by the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee.

The questions which we raised are questions which the American people have been asking. They are questions of national policy which affect every American.

When the chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee accuses us of "following closely the Khrushchev line," he is impugning our patriotism and casting an unwarranted reflection on us as individuals and as elected Representatives of the American people.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an apology is in order.

I suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that the answers to our questions should come from the President of the United States. The Congress and the people have a right to know.

### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee

on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana has informed me that he has spoken with the minority committee members and they are in agreement on this.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] are here, and they are supporting it.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1629)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter contained in the House bill and in lieu of the matter contained in the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 4. The sum authorized by section 1(e) for emergency 'Construction and equipment', and any amount, not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) hereof, shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand or modify laboratories and other installations if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds



so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest. No such funds may be used for any construction, expansion, or modification if authorizations for such construction, expansion, or modification previously has been denied by the Congress.

"Sec. 5. Paragraph 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), is amended by striking out 'ten' and inserting in lieu thereof 'thirteen', and by striking out 'two hundred and sixty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'two hundred and ninety'."

And the House agree to the same.

OVERTON BROOKS,  
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
GEORGE P. MILLER,  
OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,  
JAMES G. FULTON,  
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
JOHN STENNIS,  
STEPHEN M. YOUNG,  
THOMAS J. DODD,  
HOWARD W. CANNON,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
THOS. E. MARTIN,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Senate amendments one through ten are all of a technical, or conforming, nature. The House recedes on these amendments.

The Senate amended the bill in two other respects, both of which were of a substantive nature. On one of these amendments, the Senate receded and on the other, the House receded.

The first of the substantive Senate amendments (amendment No. 11) provides for an increase of \$50,000,000 of emergency authorization authority for "Research and development." The conditions under which the additional authorization provided under the Senate amendment may be used are set forth as follows:

"Sec. 3. The sum authorized by section 1(d) for emergency 'Research and development' shall be available for expenditure to defray the cost of research and development activities which the Administrator has determined to be urgently required in the national interest to exploit technological or scientific breakthroughs, to assure safety of personnel, to fund required research and de-

velopment program changes, to meet unusual cost variations in research and development activities, and for the other purposes of section 1(b). No portion of such sum may be obligated for expenditure or expended to defray the cost of research and development activities until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of the research or development item or activity, (2) the cost thereof, and (3) the reason why the research or development item or activity is necessary in the national interest."

The Senate amendment was agreed to by the managers on the part of the House in order to be sure that neither the space program nor the safety of personnel are jeopardized by lack of funds. It seems apparent that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has made little or no provisions in its 1961 estimates for contingencies, cost increases, or unplanned program modification. Oftentimes necessary changes, in order to insure safety of personnel and system reliability, such as the Project Mercury Program, cannot be accomplished by reprogramming alone without adverse effects on other important elements of the space program. Furthermore, information has been received that several of NASA's programs have increased in cost over original budgeted estimates. For example, current estimates of the Atlas-Agena vehicle procurement program have increased \$14,620,000. Current estimates on the Thor-Agena vehicle procurement program have increased \$300,000. Due to decisions to utilize the Centaur engine in the Saturn program, it is now estimated that \$1,500,000 must be incrementally funded in fiscal year 1961 to secure availability of Centaur vehicles for planetary missions. In all, original budget estimates are already \$20,565,000 less than the revised current estimates. It is understandable that reprogramming to fund these revised programs would have serious effects on other important programs.

The managers on the part of the House recognized that it must be anticipated that plans for, and estimated costs of, various individual research and development programs will be subject to continuing change. It is not possible to make precise forecasts for programs in which, in some cases, we are going beyond existing scientific knowledge.

The total authorization in the House bill was for \$915,000,000. The Senate amendment increases the authorization to \$970,000,000. This includes the \$50,000,000 of emergency authorization for "Research and development," explained above, and in addition a \$5,000,000 emergency authorization for "Construction and equipment." The latter \$5,000,000 emergency authorization was contained in the House bill, but since it was an emergency authorization it was not totaled with the general authorization figure. The Senate amendment included both general authorizations and emergency authorizations to make a total of \$970,000,000.

The other Senate amendment of a substantive nature, deleted section 4 of the House bill which provided 30 additional "excepted" positions with 13, rather than 10, of these positions authorized to be paid salaries up to \$21,000. The remaining positions would be within the salary ranges \$14,000 to \$19,000. The House position was that these positions were essential and that the space program could be expected to be slowed down if NASA was restricted in its efforts to employ first-class personnel. The Senate, therefore, receded to the House position. This Senate amendment also writes back into the bill the emergency "Construction and

equipment" authority of \$5,000,000. This provision was in the House bill and has been rewritten merely for purposes of clarity.

OVERTON BROOKS,  
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
GEORGE P. MILLER,  
OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,  
JAMES G. FULTON,  
GORDON L. McDONOUGH,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 532) providing for the consideration of S. 2130, a bill to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 532 provides for the consideration of S. 2130 to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The term "Bonin Islands" as used in S. 2130 includes the Bonin Islands proper, the Volcano Islands, Rosario Island, Parece Vela, and Marcus Island. This group lies about 700 miles south of Tokyo. During the war the Japanese Government evacuated from these islands the 7,000 civilian residents, all of whom were Japanese nationals. Immediately after the war the United States allowed 135 former residents of partial

occidental ancestry to return, but, for security reasons, has refused to allow any others to return.

Under article 3 of the peace treaty with Japan, the United States has the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters.

The former residents of the islands have not been successfully integrated into the Japanese economy and live in distressed economic conditions. The Japanese Government provides them with economic assistance and spends a substantial sum annually for this purpose.

The Defense Department is opposed to the repatriation of the former residents of the islands for security reasons. Failing in its efforts at repatriation, the Japanese Government sought compensation. Initially it requested \$12.5 million, but it has now agreed to accept \$6 million.

The Department of State and the Department of Defense recognize that the former residents of the islands have a legitimate claim. One problem has been how to determine the land value that would form the basis for compensation. The land has not been used for more than 15 years. It was decided to base the value on the formula used in the calculation of land values in the Ryukyu Islands, former Japanese islands now under U.S. administration. The figure adopted was \$1,060 per acre, or \$4 million for the total land value of the islands. To this was added interest dating from April 28, 1952, the effective date of the peace treaty with Japan. This brought the total up to \$6 million, the amount contained in S. 2130.

The United States will not adjudicate individual claims. When the money has been appropriated, the United States will enter into a written agreement with the Japanese Government under which the latter will engage to distribute the money to the individual families concerned. The subcommittee was assured that this payment is regarded as adequate compensation by the Bonin Islanders and will constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of the former residents against the United States.

The Bonin Islands situation is unique and the subcommittee was assured that the payment of the claims there do not constitute a precedent.

Our continued indefinite reservation of the Bonin Islands for security purposes makes impossible the repatriation of the former residents in the foreseeable future. Without any compensation the Bonin problem will remain a constant and, quite possibly, growing irritant in United States-Japanese relations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 532.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 533) providing for the consideration of H.R. 1157, a bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, House resolution 533 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1157 to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1157 is to establish a basis in law for U.S. programs for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The interest of the United States in these islands is indicated by strategic military considerations of the highest importance. Consequently, the task of administering the islands has been assigned by the President to the Department of Defense, an assignment necessitated by the inextricable linking of civil and military functions there. In the tightly constricted area of the Ryukyus, virtually all activities and policies of the local government directly affect military planning and operations. The proposed legislation would formalize existing arrangements for performing the responsibilities of the United States under the peace treaty with Japan and would provide means for maintaining and increasing the effectiveness of the performance of the basic military mission.

The Ryukyu Islands lie southeast of Japan, northeast of Formosa and the Philippines, and west of the Bonin Islands. Okinawa, the main island, is almost 6,000 miles from San Francisco, 970 miles from Tokyo, and about 920 miles from Manila.

Since 1945 the United States has exercised full powers over the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is the largest. Prior to the war these islands were an integral part of Japan, but following Japan's surrender they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupation. Unlike Japan, where occupation was carried out nominally under Allied authority, the occupation of the Ryukyus proceeded solely under American control. The measure of U.S. control was determined by international customary and conventional law as well as unilaterally by the United States. While control was restored to local institutions as they manifested a capacity to exercise it, the United States retained all powers, subject only to limitations imposed by international law.

As the sole occupier, the United States was charged with the responsibility for providing government in occupied territories, including all measures necessary to preserve public order and safety.

Although we have rebuilt and expanded the Ryukyuan economy and have given it new direction, it continues, nevertheless, to be an economy of scarcity, and from the viewpoint of natural resources it will never be anything other than that. Prior to the war, as one of the most indigent prefectures of Japan, it received annual subsidies of from \$4 million to \$6 million from the Central Government in Tokyo. Today, its population density of over 1,000 persons per square mile is twice that of Japan and one of the highest in the world. A substantial portion of its food requirements is imported each year. It has a serious shortage of industrial and commercial skills and inadequate venture capital to exploit such resources as are available. So, in spite of the reconstruction of the major part of the physical plant and the restoration of normal activity, there remains the difficult task of promoting the welfare and well-being of the Ryukyuan people, of bringing their economy closer to viability, of making them as self-sustaining as possible.

That the action proposed by H.R. 1157 is one which has been considered and approved by the Congress previously is illustrated by the fact that similar legislation has been enacted with respect to the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico.

Administrative costs of the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands will continue to require annual budgetary provision; such costs will not, however, be increased as a result of this proposed legislation. The provisions of section 4 of the bill will provide a level of economic assistance somewhat less than one-half of the average annual amount appropriated for economic aid during the period fiscal years 1947-58.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 533.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.



The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 2130, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, S. 2130, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Government of Japan the sum of \$6 million. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction in settlement of all claims of Japanese nationals resident on the Bonin Islands arising from use and benefit and exercise of property rights or interests in the Bonin Islands by the United States for security purposes. The term "Bonin Islands" as used in this bill includes the Bonin Islands proper, the Volcano Islands, Rosario Island, Parece Vela, and Marcus Island. This group of islands is about 700 miles south of Tokyo. We are holding these islands for security reasons. We have some very important military installations on these islands.

On June 2, 1959, executive communication 1055, consisting of a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitted a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan." This was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, in turn, referred by the chairman to the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific. Before action was completed by the subcommittee the Senate passed S. 2130 which was referred to the committee. Since this bill is identical with that proposed in executive communication 1055, the subcommittee held hearings on the Senate bill on August 27 and 28, 1959. On August 28 the subcommittee ordered S. 2130 favorably reported to the full committee. On January 20, 1960, the full committee unanimously ordered S. 2130 favorably reported.

To my knowledge there is no opposition to this legislation.

The interests of the United States in these islands was summed up in the communique issued by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Kishi in 1957:

The President reaffirmed the U.S. position that Japan possesses residual sovereignty over these islands. He pointed out, however, that, so long as the conditions of threat and tension exist in the Far East, the United States will find it necessary to continue the present status.

The former residents of the islands have not been successfully integrated into the Japanese economy and live in distressed economic conditions. The Japanese Government provides them with economic assistance and spends a substantial sum annually for this purpose.

In conversations with Japanese officials in 1955, 1957, and 1958, Secretary of State Dulles reiterated the opposition of the Defense Department to the repatriation of the former residents. Failing in its efforts at repatriation, the Japanese Government then sought compensation. Initially it requested \$12.5 million but it has now agreed to accept \$6 million.

The Department of State and the Department of Defense recognize that the former residents of the islands have a legitimate claim. One problem has been how to determine the land value that would form the basis for compensation. The land has not been used for more than 15 years.

During the hearings the subcommittee inquired whether the payment of the Bonin Islands claims involved a precedent for claims by former residents of other islands that had been under Japanese jurisdiction prior to the war. In a memorandum submitted by Assistant Secretary of State Parsons the subcommittee was assured that "the Bonin Islands situation is unique and that the payments of the claims there do not constitute a precedent."

Mr. Chairman, our continued indefinite reservation of the Bonin Islands for security purposes makes impossible the repatriation of the former residents in the foreseeable future. Without any compensation the Bonin problem will remain a constant and, quite possibly, growing irritant in United States-Japanese relations. For this reason I am confident the House will pass this legislation without any dissenting vote.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has explained the reason for this bill to compensate Japan for land in the Bonin Islands to which the 7,000 persons who owned it prior to the war are not being allowed to return. These persons were evacuated by Japan. They would like to go back and resume cultivation of their land, but our Armed Forces, for good and sufficient reasons, does not want any non-Americans on these islands for the present. There are about 150 persons of mixed blood and Japanese citizenship on one small island. They will not be permitted to go to the other islands.

This is a case in which I believe we are getting more than value received. We have several strategic installations in that part of the world with value up to perhaps \$1 billion. Our control of these islands and installations is essential to our security in the western Pacific. By making this payment, which has been negotiated between the two governments,

we can strengthen our position in Japan where at the present time there is great opposition on the part of some students and others to continued close cooperation between the Japanese Government and our own Government. They use this case as a source of propaganda against the United States.

When we make this payment the Japanese Government takes responsibility for handling those 7,000 former residents of the Bonins who are being barred by us from returning to their homes and property. When the tense world situation is over and we do not need such installations in the Pacific and pull out, the Japanese may want to return them to the Bonins. They can do with them as they please. But we will have discharged fully our obligations and be in the clear.

Control of these islands for as long as we need them is essential to our national security. There should be no opposition to the passage of this bill.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House, S. 2130, authorizes a payment of \$6 million to the Government of Japan. But the money is not intended for Japan or the Japanese. The ultimate beneficiaries of the payment will be the 7,000 Bonin Islanders who live in Japan and who cannot return to their native soil because our Government, as part of its defense strategy, must continue to occupy the Bonin Islands.

We do not own the Bonin Islands. We are the lawful occupants by the terms of the peace treaty we made with Japan. The payment authorized in this bill will not give us title to these islands. Nor is the payment a rental of any kind. It is compensation that is to be paid to the former residents of the islands because we have taken their land for an indefinite time. The Department of State advised our committee that the sum will constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of these people against the United States.

Thus far the Bonin Islanders have been living on the margin of economic collapse. They are a simple agricultural people with a minimum of skills. Although they are Japanese nationals, they have not been able to establish themselves in Japanese economic life. Some may ask what the future holds for these people after the \$6 million is distributed among the 7,000 former residents. No one can answer with certainty. But the sum should provide them with a modest amount of capital to establish themselves on the land or in small commercial activities or to improve their skills in order that they may enter the mainstream of the Japanese economy.

We have a right to occupy these islands. But I submit that we have a responsibility where the exercise of our right brings hardships. Our Government is neither too powerful nor too insensitive to ignore the distress of small and alien people whose plight arises from our need to use their land

for our security. It is because this bill fulfills an obligation on our part that I urge its passage.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get the record straight. We hear that this \$6 million expenditure is necessary for security reasons; and perhaps that is true. Then someone else says that it is necessary to compensate some people for an injustice, to take care of people who are in distress. Then someone else says this expenditure must be made because pressure is being put upon the Japanese Government. If this is for the security of the United States, that is one thing; but if this is for the other reasons that have been stated, I cannot go along at all with spending \$6 million because it was the Japanese who evacuated the 7,000 people who are to be benefited. We did not do it; the Japanese evacuated their own nationals and then fortified the islands. From that standpoint I can see no reason why we should compensate anybody for anything.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to add to the statement the gentleman just made that Marcus Island was the first target I bombed in the Pacific. The gentleman will be interested to know that the heaviest fortifications in the Pacific were in Marcus Island, and we suffered perhaps some of our greatest losses there.

Mr. GROSS. Is Marcus Island part of the Bonins?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The Japanese removed these people, then erected fortifications and we lost many American lives taking the Bonin Islands.

From the standpoint of the Japanese Government and the people who were evacuated I do not think we owe them anything.

If we are now paying for some security purpose, that is a different story. I understand it is proposed to pay \$879 or something like that to each displaced person. That is approximately the figure; is it not?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes; it comes out to about that.

Mr. GROSS. It is said these 7,000 people have not been integrated by the Japanese. If they have not been absorbed into the economic and social life of Japan by now they probably never will be and the \$879 per individual is not going to take care of the situation in the future.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I can assure the gentleman that the primary reason for this bill is because it is essential to our security. I can best explain it by reading from page 2 of the hearings, a statement by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs:

The State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee decided in 1945 that the Bonin Islands

should be closed for security reasons to all other settlement. This policy, which has subsequently been reviewed several times, remains in effect.

That is the decision that was made and the reasons for the decision. It has been necessary for us to keep control of these islands.

Maybe we should have taken them in the peace treaty, I do not know. But the fact is we did not take them, and we do not own the islands. Japan owns the islands.

Mr. GROSS. The Japanese Government has residual sovereignty, whatever that means.

Mr. JUDD. The Bonins are not like some of the other areas where we have control. Japan has renounced ownership of those. Here is a case where they own the islands and we need them for the present. Japan has agreed to this arrangement. It quiets all of the claims against us and gives us security—physical, emotional, and military—in that area.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get this down to cases. I can go along with this bill if it is for security reasons.

Mr. JUDD. I give the gentleman that flat assurance.

Mr. GROSS. But I do not go along with it if we are paying off the Japanese.

Mr. JUDD. Neither would I.

Mr. GROSS. Then let us leave out the extraneous and specious statements in behalf of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. The only reason we bring that consideration in is because a troublesome situation has arisen for us and Japan on account of the agitation of some individuals and groups over this issue. The Japanese Government says it can quiet the situation and remove this thorn in our relations and settle the problem with this payment.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think it is going to be done that way. Let me say now that I hope you will not come in here with another bill for \$6 million or more in order to placate these people later on.

Mr. JUDD. There is no other situation in the Pacific at all comparable to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I may say the gentleman from Iowa, knowing something about this situation, that I add my word of endorsement to this proposition. It is a matter of security and goes directly to the point the gentleman, I know, will agree with.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I want to say again I do not like these other issues being brought in. I do not think we are going to satisfy these people over the years with the payment of \$879 apiece. I do not think that is going to happen, and I want to clear the record now and say that we are paying this \$6 million for security reasons.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the Japanese Government first wanted \$12.5 million but in a very short period of time reduced the asking price to \$6 million, more than 50 percent. I hope this will be the last we hear of this deal. I do not like it, but if it will take care of a vital security problem, affecting our own people, I will go along with it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be learned in matters of our relations with foreign nations, but I do have confidence in the work of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is very modest when he says he is not learned in foreign affairs. I consider the gentleman one of the most impressive and learned gentlemen on that subject.

Mr. ASPINALL. Our distinguished floor leader is very charitable in his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill is in the interest of our national security. You heard a moment ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] state that he was one of the first who saw this particular area when our military drive was taken up towards Japan. May I say that the gentleman now speaking is one of the Members of Congress who last saw this area.

It so happens that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction over the Pacific area. We have jurisdiction over the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas to the west.

In that jurisdiction we have some responsibility over the northern part of the Marianas. This last year it was necessary for the committee, composed of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCGINLEY], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and myself together with a staff member, to go into this particular area. We received permission from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to visit in the Bonin Island area. Our committee does not have jurisdiction over the Bonins. However, we thought it would be appropriate for us, with his permission, to go into the area. Accordingly we visited Iwo Jima and Chi Chi Jima. These names mean very much to us. The name Bonin Islands is practically unknown to the American people. But, when I speak of Iwo Jima and Suribachi, you know what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this legislation for two reasons, and it is because of these two reasons I wish to secure some information from the committee handling the bill. The first question has to do with the 140 or so citizens of Japan citizenship presently living on Chi Chi Jima Island. I also wish to know if there is any relationship or if any comparison can be made between the moneys that we are to pay



in this particular instance and the moneys which we are paying or are to pay for lands in the Marshalls area.

Last fall when we visited the Bonins we were in the company of Rear Adm. W. R. Eardman. If you do not think that this is an isolated area so far as we in the United States are concerned, you are mistaken. It is very difficult to get into. And, when one finds living in Chi Chi Jima approximately 140 people, many of whom have their family heritage in our own country, names like Savory and Webb from the New England area, descendants of New Englanders formerly engaged in the whaling business, and Washington, another name that is very common there, then he can understand why it is that those 140 have been allowed to return while others have not been given such permission.

There were almost 10,000 Japanese civilians living on these islands during the time just preceding the war. The war came on and most of the civilians were removed to other areas under Japan's jurisdiction. After the fighting was over most of the former residents of the Bonins were found to be in Japan proper. We permitted people of American lineage to return, and that is how the 140 happen to be there at the present time.

In the Marshall Islands to the east, where we have such islands as Kwajalein, we have 70.4 square miles of land area, while in the Bonin Islands we have 45 square miles of land area. There are 14,350 inhabitants living in the Marshalls at the present time. You can see what that land means to them. On Kwajalein, one of the larger islands in the group, the Defense Department has been using the entire area since its occupation by our military forces in 1944. For years we have been negotiating with the Marshallese on a fair value of their land. We do not know how much longer we will have use for it, but probably indefinitely, something like we have with the Japanese in their Bonin Island group. The Marshallese want the title to the land to remain in their names also. We have offered them \$500 an acre for an indefinite term of use. Some of the owners have accepted this price; others have not accepted the price offered.

Now, with that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], a few questions. What items of reimbursement are covered by the \$6 million? Are they public, private, personal, or liability values?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Private and personal items of reimbursement are covered.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not a fact that when people are taken from an area under conquest, by tradition they are usually allowed to return to that area?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true.

Mr. ASPINALL. Here they are not permitted to return.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They are not permitted to return because we have decided that it is not in our national interest.

Mr. ASPINALL. Where will the title to the land involved remain?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Title to the land will remain with the Japanese, but, in effect, we obtain title to that land since we have indefinite use of these islands.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will this legislation permit claims to be made by individual Japanese against the United States?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the present 140 inhabitants of the Bonin Islands—and these are the descendants of the Saveries and Webbs and Washingtons—be able to occupy or use the land as long as the United States remains in possession of the islands?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. On Chi Chi Jima, presumably, yes; on other islands, no.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the residents of Chi Chi Jima receive their proportionate share of these moneys?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No. This money is only for those former Bonin Islanders who are not permitted to return to the islands and who are now residing in Japan.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will these inhabitants of Chi Chi Jima be able to get any title to the lands they now occupy?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; not under this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does the gentleman think that this \$6 million sum could be considered as rent for the use of the land since 1945 to date? If so, within a few years, if the United States continues to occupy the islands will there be another payment forthcoming?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; this is a final settlement. May I point out to my distinguished friend that it is not a rental payment.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I stated just a moment ago, I am interested because of the effect that this has relative to the Marshall Islands of the Trust Territory. For example, on Kwajalein Island, one of the many islands of the Marshall group, the entire area was taken over by the military in 1944. The title still remains with the Marshallese landowners. The High Commissioner of the Trust Territory has been given authority to offer the Marshallese \$500 an acre for the use of the land since 1944. The Marshallese, through their attorney, have refused the offer and have brought court action. Now my question is this: How did you arrive at the figure of \$1,060 per acre for the land in the Bonins? I realize that land is a very valuable asset to the Japanese but I do not know how it can be more valuable than it is to the Marshallese.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In answer to the gentleman, it is my understanding that the Department of State in negotiations with the Japanese used land value plus labor and input value of various kinds. I wish to call attention to the statement on page 11 of the hearings where Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Parsons, in reply to a question states:

The figure of \$6 million is based on the formula used in the calculation of Ryukyuan land values where you assign 40 percent of the production from a given unit of land to land value and 60 percent to labor and input of various kinds. Then the 40

percent is capitalized at 6 percent; this is multiplied by 16%, and you arrive at the figure through that process.

The value of land in the Ryukyus, as the gentleman will recall, is \$1,060 per acre.

Mr. ASPINALL. Can my distinguished colleague state whether or not he believes there is any relationship between the formula which his committee has used in this instance and the formula that might be used in determining the values of the Marshallese?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No; there is no relationship.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to add that they have no relationship because in the Marshall Islands we are paying rent. In the Bonins we are paying the Japanese Government the value of the land and it can do as it pleases with respect to these citizens. It intends to compensate them for this land. There is no precedent in this case that could be applied to the Marshalls.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say that that is exactly what I wanted stated while we are considering this legislation. We do have this legal controversy; we do have a suit in court at the present time and if we are not careful this action might be used against us.

Mr. Chairman, may I make one statement to my colleagues of the House. We held a special meeting with the Bonin Islands Council members when we were on Chi Chi Jima. If my friends would like to have some very interesting reading—it would take about 10 minutes—it would bring to their minds how people who have their heritage in our own country feel about their ties to a country with which they have no common citizenship, but who wish to have such ties in the future, if they can obtain them.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield further, may I suggest that the gentleman insert the minutes of the council meeting at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the following is the transcript of the hearings of the meeting held by the Council of Chi Chi Jima when our special committee was present in that area:

CHI CHI JIMA, B.I.—MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL BONIN ISLAND COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 19, 1959

The meeting was called to order at 19:35. Present were Lt. Comdr. T. G. Rice, military government representative; Rodrick Webb, president; Jerry Savory, member; Jessie Webb, member; Mitsuru Ikeda, member; Frank Gonzales, member. Special guests were Hon. W. N. Aspinall, Representative from Colorado; Hon. D. F. McGinley, Representative from Nebraska; Hon. D. K. Inouye, Representative from Hawaii; Hon. B. F. Slisk, Representative from California; Rear Adm. W. L. Erdmann, COMNAVMARIANAS; Dr. Jack Taylor, Consultant on Territorial Affairs. Guests were Lt. Comdr. L. E. Traubado, MC, USN; Lt. (jg.) S. L. Erwin, Assistant OIC; Richard Washington, judge, Bonin Island court.

The military government representative opened the meeting by introducing the House Insular Affairs Committee to the council members. He explained to the committee members that the Bonin Island Council was comprised of five members elected by a general election. The member receiving the most votes sits as President of the council. The term of office is for 1 year. He explained that all persons over 18 years of age were eligible to vote and that we have experienced 100 percent participation as a result of an ordinance whereby a person is fined if they fail to vote. He also explained that the judge of the Bonin Island court is an appointed office and that the council members sat as the court. He told the committee that the council met once a month, and that the minutes were recorded and sent to the Military Governor via the Deputy Military Governor. He explained that the president of the council presided at the meetings. At the request of the president, the military government representative reads the minutes of the previous meeting and then presents to the Council any information that is pertinent received from the Military Governor or Deputy Military Governor, and any other information of interest, i.e., ship and airplane arrivals, problems of a logistic nature, etc. The president of the council then asks each member to present anything that they wish and to bring up any problems that they have been presented with during the previous month. The council discusses and votes on any matter that requires a decision. He explained that revenue is obtained by taxation of gross income. The tax at present is 3 percent. This money goes to the community fund, and is used as the council sees fit. At the present there is \$1,831.88 in the community fund. There is only one person on the island receiving their support from this fund; the rest of the islanders are gainfully employed and are self-sufficient. He explained that the economy of the island is increasing each year.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the resolutions and ordinances passed on by the council were subject to veto by the military government representative.

The military government representative replied that none had been vetoed.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the military government representative sat with the members of the Bonin Island Council at the monthly meetings.

The military government representative replied that he sat with the council at all meetings, and that he also sat with the Bonin Island court as an advisory member.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the military government representative acts in an advisory capacity at the council meetings when decisions of a legislative nature, especially those involving raising revenue and appropriating funds are acted on.

The military government representative replied that he did.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the president of the Bonin Island Council if he exercised his prerogative as president by presiding at the monthly meetings or if the military government representative presided at the monthly meetings.

Rodrick Webb replied that he presided at the monthly meetings.

The military government representative again reiterated that due to the close proximity, so many of the civil problems dovetailed with those of the military that he acted in an advisory capacity on these matters. Matters solely of a civil nature were left to the members of the council insofar as possible.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if any member of the Bonin Island Council had ever served in a governing capacity when the Japanese governed the island.

He was informed that no member had served in such a capacity.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the council members if they were satisfied with their present form of government.

He was informed by the council members that they were satisfied.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the Deputy Military Governor if he or members of his staff reviewed the minutes of the Bonin Island Council meetings.

The Deputy Military Governor replied that he personally reviewed the minutes of the council meetings and without exception he has passed on these minutes and has then forwarded them to the Military Governor.

Congressman ASPINALL asked the age of the person receiving help from the community fund.

Jerry Savory, council member, informed him that she herself did not know her true age, but information gathered from other elderly people of the island placed her age in the vicinity of 70 years. He explained that she had no one to care for her and that each month she received provisions paid for by the community fund from the Bonin Island Trading Co.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if there were any other elder people of the island that felt they too should receive help from the community fund.

Jerry Savory said that to his knowledge there were none. He explained that the rest of the elderly people either were still gainfully employed or had children and family to care for them.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if it was more or less the custom of the people of the islands to care for their elder people within the family if such was possible.

Jerry Savory replied that it was the custom.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the members of the council were paid for their services.

Jerry Savory explained that the president of the council received \$10 per month, members \$5 per month, and that the judge of the Bonin Islands court received 10 percent of fines imposed.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if there were many cases tried by the Bonin Islands court.

The military government representative explained that very few cases were tried by the court and that the offenses were minor in nature.

Congressman ASPINALL explained to the members of the council that the committee which he represented had jurisdiction over only the unincorporated or Trust Territories of the Pacific but inasmuch as they were to be in this area they had requested permission to visit the Bonin Islands as guests of the Deputy Military Governor and military government representative to meet with the representatives of the people of the Bonin Islands to hear their views and to find out if they were satisfied with their present form of military government, and that they would report to Congress on their findings. He asked if any members of the council had anything they would like to discuss with the committee.

Jessie Webb asked if the committee could give any information on any decisions pertaining to the ownership of the houses and land on which the people of the Bonin Islands lived.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that as he understood it, until land titles could be determined that it would be impossible to give title to any person living on the property.

The military government representative explained that the Bonin Islanders were concerned over titles to property and houses in the event the Japanese again took possession of the islands. He explained that he believed that the houses would belong to the Bonin Islanders as long as the Navy remained on the islands.

Congressman ASPINALL told the council that Senator FULBRIGHT had introduced and the Senate had passed a bill whereby \$6 million would be paid to the Japanese Government to settle with the Japanese people that were dispossessed from the Bonin Islands for the property they owned.

Congressman SISK asked when the Japanese originally settled the island.

Jerry Savory explained that Nathaniel Savory and his party of settlers whom the vast majority of the Bonin Islanders are descendants settled the island in 1830, and the Japanese did not settle the island until 1871. The Japanese were not successful in their attempt to settle in 1871 and left the island to return in 1873, this time to stay.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the Japanese settled on land owned by the Savory settlers or settled on land of their own.

The military government representative informed him that the land acquired by the Japanese was by legal methods as far as known.

The military government representative explained that basically what the Bonin Islanders are concerned with is that with the exception of possibly three, none of them live on their own homesteads and as they develop their homes and property they are concerned about the security of their homes and homesteads. Therefore, they would like to know that if the Japanese Government accepts the \$6 million as payment for land rights if they will then be given title to the homes and properties.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that it was his understanding that if the Japanese Government accepts the \$6 million in lieu of claims to property by the former Japanese inhabitants of the Bonin Islands, then the U.S. Government would then hold title to the land, at which time a land officer representing the Navy would see that the land was surveyed and that the people that lived in these areas would be protected in their properties.

At this point Congressman ASPINALL read the bill passed by the Senate whereby \$6 million would be paid to the Japanese Government for land rights in the Bonin Islands.

Congressman ASPINALL explained that the bill meant that as long as the U.S. Government maintained possession of the Bonin Islands that neither the Japanese Government or the Japanese nationals that were former residents of the Bonin Islands would have any claims against any of the property. In the event that the United States should enter into an agreement to turn the islands back to Japan then there would have to be some provision in that agreement as to the property rights of the Bonin Islanders that have returned and made their homes here.

Congressman SISK said that as he understood the wording of the bill that the payment of the \$6 million would be nothing but payment for an indefinite use permit without any title at all, similar to the bill proposed in the Marshall Islands, maintaining the residual sovereignty of Japan, so that if the Japanese came back to these islands they could reclaim their lands without any reimbursement. He asked if he was right in interpreting the bill this way.

Congressman ASPINALL said that he was correct unless provision was made in the final agreement whereby the Bonin Islanders would be protected.

Congressman SISK said that he was pursuing this line of questioning to aid him in determining which position he would take when this legislation reached the House of Representatives. He said he had doubts as to whether the Japanese people had a legitimate claim to the \$6 million for the land in view of the fact that the people presently living in the Bonin Islands had a claim due to prior settling of the islands. He asked when the Bonin Islanders were sent to Japan.



Jerry Savory told him that they were sent to Japan in 1944.

Congressman SISK asked if any of the members of the council owned land in the Bonin Islands at that time.

Frank Gonzales said that he owned the land that is presently known as Jack Williams Beach.

Congressman SISK asked if he now lived on that land.

Frank Gonzales said that he did not live on that land at the present.

The military government representative said that it appeared to him that even if provision was made in the final agreement for protection of the Bonin Islanders' property, they would be dependent upon the Japanese Government to honor the provision and would have to go through Japanese courts for that protection.

Congressman ASPINALL said that in his opinion they would be protected by international law and could go to the Hague Court of the United Nations for protection.

Congressman SISK said that if the Japanese broke the treaty, then it would fall under the jurisdiction of international law and would then have to be taken to the Hague court.

Congressman SISK asked that assuming this treaty was written into the present bill, and these islands were returned to Japan, if the Bonin Islanders were fearful of the Japanese not honoring the treaty.

Jerry Savory said that the majority of the Bonin Islands were, but they were especially concerned for the security of the younger generation. He said they all hoped the United States would keep the responsibility of the islands as long as possible.

Congressman INOUYE asked if the sentiments expressed by the Council were those of the people of the island.

Jerry Savory said that they were.

Congressman ASPINALL asked approximately what percentage of the people were in favor of the United States retaining administrative control of the Bonin Islands.

Jerry Savory explained that in 1952 when a delegation of Bonin Islanders went to Washington that 100 percent of the people signed a petition stating they wanted the United States to retain control.

The military government representative polled the Council and asked that if they were asked to sign a petition now if the same percentage of people would sign.

Each member of the Council said they believed that 100 percent of the people would sign such a petition.

Congressman ASPINALL asked how the people would feel if the islands to the south were returned to Japan.

Jerry Savory said that he felt the people would be grateful if Haha Jima could be retained in view of the number of young people. He said he felt that they should have more area in which to settle and make their homes.

Congressman SISK asked how far Haha Jima was from Chi Chi Jima.

The military government representative explained that Haha Jima, a larger island than Chi Chi Jima was located 25 miles to the south.

Congressman SISK asked if there were any families presently living on Haha Jima.

The military government representative told him that the island is uninhabited at the present.

Jerry Savory said that if the United States could retain possession of Haha Jima, the large number of young people that will soon reach adulthood would then have a place to settle and make homes for themselves.

Congressman MCINLEY said that he had heard that there was difficulty in the Bonin Islanders getting married and asked if someone would explain that situation to him.

Jerry Savory explained that due to the close relationship of the Bonin Islanders,

that it was not desirable for them to intermarry. Therefore, the vast majority of the male population go to Japan to seek wives.

Congressman ASPINALL asked if the young females of the islands could go to Japan to seek husbands.

Jerry Savory said that although none had, that it was possible for them to do so.

Congressman ASPINALL asked that if they went to Guam or Japan and married, if they would be permitted to return to the Bonin Islands.

Jerry Savory told him that it would not only be possible, but they would be welcomed.

The military government representative explained there was one island woman married to a Saipanese and another to the principal of the school, a U.S. citizen from Hawaii, and that they were quite happy.

Congressman INOUYE asked if the Bonin Islanders were satisfied with their school system and medical facilities.

Rodrick Webb said that they were satisfied.

(NOTE.—The above transcription is but a portion of the minutes. No further minutes were recorded.)

RODRICK WEBB,  
President, Bonin Islands Council.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to congratulate my esteemed friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, and to commend him for his fine presentation. He has a thorough understanding of the problems at hand and has consistently shown deep concern for the security of our Nation and for our position in that part of the world. The gentleman from Colorado has presented in detail arguments why this legislation should be passed. I wish to thank him for his contribution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is timely that S. 2130, which was passed by the other body unanimously, which was reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously, and which was granted a rule by the Rules Committee unanimously, should come before us today. It is a bill of equity and good conscience, presenting Uncle Sam in the image of fairness and of honesty. It is just and meritorious.

I have said that its consideration today is timely. Only last week, on May 19, the treaty of mutual cooperation and security with the United States was approved by the Japanese House of Representatives after a bitter battle with Communists and neutralists. The Japanese House of Councilors still must give its concurrence. The great majority of the men and women of Japan I am sure have a friendly sentiment toward the United States, but there are elements that are seeking to undermine that sentiment of friendship. The prompt and I hope the unanimous passage of S. 2130 will remove one of the irritants that the enemies of the United States have been using in their propaganda.

Aside from my desire as a Member of the Congress of the United States to join with my colleagues in presenting to the world the image of Uncle Sam always as

fair and honorable, I have a personal interest in the passage of this bill. At one time, a few years ago, I had the distinction of representing more Japanese-American constituents than any other Member of the House. That probably is not the case at the present time, but certainly there are not more than three or four congressional districts today in which more Japanese-Americans reside. Mrs. Mary Ono, of my staff at my Chicago office, was the first Japanese-American congressional secretary in the history of the Congress.

There are no finer or more staunchly loyal Americans than those of Japanese blood and descent. The parents of some of the Japanese-Americans in my district as well as in other districts came from the Bonin Islands and they with all Americans of Japanese ancestry are concerned with bettering relations with Japan in the interest of peace and prosperity in the Pacific.

I lunched last week with Shig Wakamatsu, national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, and I am proud to say one of my most distinguished constituents, Mike M. Masaoka, the popular and tireless Washington representative of the league, and John Yoshino. The conversation centered on S. 2130. They thought that the enactment of this legislation was long overdue. It is merely a matter of doing the right and the decent thing, not for the Government of Japan, but for human beings, men and women and children whose lands were taken for military use by our Government and who are in need due to their enforced dislocation. I trust the bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from a letter by Mr. Masaoka:

Although it has not been officially acted upon by the JACL because we have not had a Biennial National Convention since 1958, many of our members whose parents are from the Bonin Islands and many more of us Americans of Japanese ancestry, who are concerned with bettering cooperation and relations with Japan in the interests of peace and prosperity in the Pacific, are most assuredly for it.

The bill itself was passed unanimously by the Senate and reported unanimously by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Rules Committee. It has the approval of the State and Defense Departments.

The bill simply corrects an inequity in our treatment of two former Japanese island chains in which residual sovereignty continues to be in Japan but whose administration remains, under the identical provision of the Treaty of Peace, with the U.S. Armed Forces. In the case of the Ryukyus, including Okinawa, Japanese nationals whose lands are used for military purposes by our Government are paid rentals. In the case of the Bonins, however, including Ogawara, Japanese nationals whose lands are being used for military purposes by our Government have never received compensation of any kind whatsoever from the United States. Moreover, Japanese nationals who are former residents of these islands still are not permitted to return to their native home 15 years after the end of hostilities.

This legislation, long overdue, merely attempts to equalize the treatment accorded to Japanese nationals of both the Ryukyus and the Bonins. It provides authorization for the payment of \$6 million to the Japanese Government for distribution to these

former residents of the Bonin Islands. To our mind, this is much too small an amount to be paid, but, since the Japanese Government has agreed to this sum we have no alternative at this time but to agree.

There are realities in the world today that make it more important than ever that we do everything possible to maintain cordial relations with Japan. This is the centennial of diplomatic relations between Japan and the United States. The Japanese House of Representatives approved only yesterday (May 19) the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security with the United States after a long and bitter battle with the Communists, leftists, and neutralists. The House of Councillors must still concur in that ratification. The Prime Minister of the Soviet Union last week threatened Japan, and other nations that allow us to base our planes on their territories, with annihilation by nuclear missiles. Neighboring Red China constantly and continuously tries to lure Japan away from the free world. The President of the United States is scheduled to visit Japan in about a month, while the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan are slated to return that good-will visit this fall. Surely, in the light of these circumstances, there can be no reason to deny the former Japanese residents of the Bonin Islands the same treatment in the use of their lands as we have done and are doing for the Japanese residents of the Ryukyus.

The amount is small, but the principle of discrimination that currently characterizes our consideration of the Japanese nationals of the Ryukyus and the Bonins looms large in the hearts and minds of all the Japanese people, not just those formerly resident in the Bonins. The former residents of these islands have conducted themselves with dignity through the past 15 years since the end of hostilities, even though they have and are suffering privations on the so-called Japanese mainland, never resorting to the undemocratic methods of the totalitarians and the Communists but constantly appealing through the democratic system of petition in the faith that American sense of fair play and good conscience would vindicate their gentlemanly procedures. Now that they are on the threshold of witnessing democracy in action correcting an injustice, we trust that the House of Representatives will not frustrate them and their dreams.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay to the Government of Japan a sum of \$6,000,000. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction and settlement of all claims of Japanese nationals, formerly resident in the Bonin Islands, arising from the use, benefit, or exercise of property rights or interests in the Bonin Islands by the United States for security purposes, for the period beginning April 28, 1952, and continuing until such time as said use, benefit, or exercise is relinquished by the United States.*

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$6,000,000 to carry out the purpose of this Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado seems to want to give the impression that this problem arises as the result of our conquest of the Bonin Islands. I want to reemphasize that this problem grows out of the Japanese

evacuation of their own nationals from those islands at the start of the war and their subsequent fortification of the islands and then the military necessity for us to take the islands. So the problem does not grow out of our conquest of the islands as such. These were Japanese nationals who were removed by the Japanese Government and taken to Japan at the start of the war. The care of these people is basically a responsibility of the Japanese Government.

Now, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. In his opinion, will this set a precedent for future payments?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, it will not set a precedent. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the reply made by the Assistant Secretary of State, J. Graham Parsons, to the very question I asked him publicly, which appears on page 6 of the hearings. I asked:

Are we setting a precedent for future claims in the Pacific?

And he answered:

We have not so foreseen it. There has been no other case that has come to my attention, in my time in the Department at least, where former residents have claimed that they should either be allowed to go back or that we should compensate them.

In other words, he said this would certainly not set a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. And, in the personal opinion of the gentleman from Wisconsin, we are not setting a precedent?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. On the basis of the testimony we have received, I can give the gentleman the unequivocal answer that we are not setting a precedent.

Mr. GROSS. Will Japan reimburse us when we leave the Bonin Islands if and when we no longer need this area for security purposes? In the opinion of the gentleman, will Japan reimburse us for the \$6 million to be appropriated?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, under the treaty negotiated with Japan, Japan certainly will not be repaying us the \$6 million that we are actually giving to the Japanese Government for distribution to the Bonin Islanders who are no longer residents on the islands or permitted to return to the Bonin Islands.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman permit me to ask the sponsor of this legislation whether or not there was any testimony which would indicate that these Japanese nationals while on these islands in any way were helping the Japanese armed forces at the time our own young men were trying to capture those islands?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I will be very happy to answer the gentleman's question. I am sure, if the gentleman read the report, he would see that these former residents of the Bonin Islands were no longer on the islands at the time that we captured them and they were of no assistance to the Japanese either in holding the islands or in fighting our forces. They were evacuated and moved to Japan.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If that is the case, then I think the gentleman from Iowa certainly makes a very strong point. The fact is that these people were evacuated not as a result of any of our activities, but rather as a result of the activities of the Japanese Government, and yet we are being asked to compensate them for their loss.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. But the gentleman from Illinois should bear in mind that we are now preventing them from returning to these islands.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to apologize to the gentleman from Iowa personally. I was unavoidably detained. But does the gentleman think he needs a quorum or does it make no difference?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Michigan does not have to apologize to me for anything.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman think he should have a quorum? Do you need any help for this economy program that you have been on?

Mr. GROSS. No; the gentleman from Iowa is not interested in a quorum at this time, but he is interested in all the help he can get in behalf of economy and he knows he can depend upon the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan, pursuant to House Resolution 532, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the legislation may extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State



of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1157, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. AREND] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is now recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, although this bill, H.R. 1157, bears my name, it is actually one which not only is sponsored by the executive branch, and specifically the Army, but also has received the special attention of the Secretary of Defense, who not long ago urged by a letter to Mr. VINSON that the bill be given prompt consideration because of its importance. I might mention that the former Delegate from Hawaii, John A. Burns, who has known the Okinawan people so well, also sponsored this legislation.

A single sentence description of what the bill will do is that it will permit the retention in the Ryukyu Islands of funds which would be used in the Ryukyus for various governmental purposes.

The bill, however, required more detailed description of these funds and their use in the Ryukyus since there are at least three types of funds covered by the bill.

Section 2 of the bill deals with fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, and other moneys received by the government of the Ryukyu Islands.

At this point, I would like to describe briefly what the government of the Ryukyu Islands is. It is headed by a chief executive who is appointed by the U.S. High Commissioner. The rest of the government, which is made up of mayors and other local governing officials and a unicameral legislature, are all elected officials. In section 2, it is this part of the government of the Ryukyus which is being referred to.

The funds received by the GRI, as it is called, are derived—as the bill indicates—from fines, fees, taxes, and so forth. In 1960, it is estimated that they will total \$22.4 million. These funds are now retained in the Ryukyus and with respect to them, the bill would provide specific legal sanction for this practice.

The section 2 funds are used today and would continue to be used for the cost involved in all of the normal functions of a national government except those pertaining to national defense and international political relations. These functions would, of course, include education, public health and welfare, pub-

lic safety, public works and services, economic development, and general government.

The next group of funds involved in the bill are those which are the subject of section 3. These are funds which are derived by the U.S. civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from the several sources set out in the bill itself, that is to say, public-benefit trusts, business type operations, corporations—wholly or partly owned by the civil administration, and from fines, fees, and forfeitures. These funds are estimated to total \$3 million in 1960. They would be used for programs approved by the Federal Government for matters such as typhoon relief, aid to municipalities and other similar functions. The funds referred to in (a) and (b) of section 3 are, like the section 2 funds, now retained in the Ryukyus for expenditure for the purpose I have described.

The funds referred to in subsection (c) of section 3, however, now are deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This represents the smallest amount of funds involved in the bill being only about \$50,000 for 1960.

Section 4: This section injects a new concept into the financing of activities in the Ryukyu Islands. The funds referred to in this section are Federal income taxes withheld from the pay of U.S. citizens in the Ryukyus. These funds now aggregate about \$9 million annually. At the present time, of course, these taxes are covered into the U.S. Treasury. The Federal Government through the annual budgetary process, appropriates funds for the purposes set out in 4 (a) and (b), that is, promoting the economic development and improving the welfare of the people of the Ryukyus, and reimbursing the GRI for services performed by reason of our Armed Forces in the islands.

Under section 4, not to exceed \$6 million in any fiscal year could be appropriated to the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands to be spent for the purposes stated in the section.

With respect to subsection (c) of section 4, I would like to point out that disaster relief funds, which have been provided by the United States up to this time, have been obtained by reprogramming, with serious difficulty and delay, cash proceeds from Public Law 480 commodity sales in other parts of the world. Actually, commodity grants would be continued to be sought to meet the emergency food requirements but section 4(c) would provide funds for rehabilitation construction.

We all know that Okinawa and the Ryukyus generally are subject every year to devastating typhoons. And the care of the people and the rehabilitation of structures destroyed must be considered as an essential part of their fiscal administration.

The question quite naturally arises as to why present procedures of financing in the Ryukyus are not permitted to continue as in the past.

In the first place, the legal authority for the retention of those funds now kept in the Ryukyus is not absolutely

clear, and legislation to render this authority clear is, therefore, necessary.

Section 4 of the bill, regardless of its reference to Federal income tax collections in the Ryukyus, is actually nothing more or less than a straight authorization for the appropriation of funds for the specific purposes stated in the section itself. These purposes are, generally, to promote the economy generally of the Ryukyu Islands, to reimburse the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed on account of the presence in the islands of our Armed Forces, and for emergency purposes relating to disasters, including typhoons, in that area.

It will be noted that the bill as submitted by the Department has been modified in several respects, the most important of which is through the insertion of language on page 3, lines 7 and 8, which render entirely clear that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress will actively participate and, indeed, make all of the final decisions with respect to the funds that are appropriated under this section. The language that I am referring to is as follows: "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts."

As the bill read prior to the committee's amendments, the language gave every appearance of actually appropriating funds. This action is not within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Ours is an authorizing committee. We have neither the desire nor the power to appropriate funds. The Appropriations Committees are the ones to make recommendations in this respect based upon a specific authorization which is being provided in this bill.

Perhaps more important than the specific legal reasons for enacting legislation of this kind is the very special relationship which exists between the people of the Ryukyus and our Government. The Ryukyus are, at least from a lay standpoint, a strange mixture of a foreign country and a country that is not foreign.

Under the treaty of peace with Japan, Japan retained what is called residual sovereignty. This term is extremely difficult to define, but I believe a fair statement of its practical effect is to give the United States complete control over all matters relating to the administration of these islands.

These rights are accompanied by responsibilities, and the responsibilities, too, are rather special in this instance, because, for one reason or another, the entire nonfree world has fastened a most interested eye on Okinawa and the rest of the Ryukyus and it has, therefore, become, as it has frequently been expressed, a showcase of democracy.

This bill will give legal sanction to the retention of essential moneys in the Ryukyus. It will establish a sound relationship, both fiscal and psychological, between those islands and this country—a relationship which all informed persons state to be of paramount importance.

At the recommendation of the Comptroller General, a new section 8 was added to the bill which would render certain that all the financial transactions of the U.S. civil administration in the Ryukyus shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950.

Because of questions which quite naturally arise with respect to section 4, I would like to deal with it in a little more detail at this time.

The language in section 4 is by no means unique. Section 4 adopts a policy which has general precedents in the case of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico in that in those two places, certain taxes were, and in the case of Puerto Rico are, for exactly the same reason as they would be in section 4.

In addition to these general precedents, there are very specific precedents in the case of the Virgin Islands and Guam. In the case of the Virgin Islands, all of the U.S. income taxes collected there are covered into the treasury of the Virgin Islands and held for use in the Virgin Islands.

In the case of Guam, all Federal income taxes are covered into the treasury of Guam and are for use in Guam.

So we are not embarking on anything brand new here.

I make particular note of these precedents only because of the somewhat unusual language of section 4. Actually, the bill by no means grants authority even remotely as broad as the previous acts of Congress relating to the Virgin Islands of Guam. In those cases, the taxes are actually covered into the local treasury. In the case of the Ryukyus, it is our intention only to indicate in a very general way that some funds are generated through income taxes in Okinawa and the Ryukyus and that within clearly defined limitations, a portion of these can be authorized for appropriation to the Ryukyus for use in that area for the purposes stated.

The authority previously granted for Guam and the Virgin Islands is very much broader than the bare basic authority which is being sought here. Appropriations must still be made under the language of section 4 of the bill. Since, as I indicated previously, the committee carefully amended the bill so as to require that the obligation and expenditure of any of the moneys in section 4 shall be "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts."

Prior to the war, Okinawa and the rest of the Ryukyus were an integral part of Japan. Following Japan's surrender, they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purpose of occupancy. And the occupancy was not under allied authority but solely under American authority.

From 1945, when we took Okinawa by conquest, until 1952, our rights and responsibilities were those expressed in the Hague Convention of 1907 and later carried over to the Geneva Convention of 1949.

In 1952, we entered into a peace treaty with Japan. Under article III of that treaty, the United States obtained the right "to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants" of the Ryukyus. Japan retained only what is called residual sovereignty.

Because the islands are under the jurisdiction of the United States, they do not qualify for the generous benefits provided for free foreign governments under the Mutual Security Acts or other assistance programs. Neither do they receive the benefits which are accorded territorial and insular possessions of the United States.

Because of this peculiar relationship, which I have said is unique, we have assumed rather unusual responsibilities. One of the hardest of these responsibilities to convey as an idea is the importance of providing the Ryukyus with what I will call a reasonably assured source of revenue for necessary works in the islands and thereby give them a reasonably stable economy.

The committee language will have a strong psychological effect in that it will give strong evidence of our intentions to stay in the islands, help the local people, and provide a truly stable economy.

I think it will be of interest to the Members of the House to know that the Comptroller General has expressed his general agreement with the purposes of this bill in his letter dated March 30, 1959, addressed to the chairman of the full committee. The Comptroller General states:

We agree that legislation such as that contained in H.R. 1157 is desirable in order to provide a basis in law for the programs referred to therein. Furthermore, the provisions of section 3(b) would serve to remove any doubt as to the authority of the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyus Islands to create corporations wholly or partly owned or controlled by the Civil Administration which might arise by reason of section 304 of the Government Corporation Control Act.

I have already referred to the Comptroller General's other recommendation with respect to insuring his right to audit the accounts of the High Commissioner.

The one objection which the Comptroller General set out in this letter has, I think, been adequately disposed of through the insertion of language in section 4 which renders entirely clear the fact that the Appropriations Committees and the Congress generally will participate actively in any appropriations made for Okinawa and the Ryukyus pursuant to this section.

The bill is a sound one and is one which has been long needed in order to provide a sound legislative basis for our operations in the Ryukyus. I urge prompt and favorable consideration of the bill as a necessary step toward the proper maintenance of what is without doubt the most important military installation of our country in the Far East.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned residual sovereignty. Does not Japan have residual sovereignty over the Ryukyus?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; it does.

Mr. GROSS. Do we have residual sovereignty over Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other islands that the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. PRICE. The real point is how long we are going to be in the Ryukyus. The indications are we are going to be in the Ryukyus for many, many years.

Mr. GROSS. But is there a real comparison as between the Ryukyus and the other islands you have mentioned?

Mr. PRICE. At the present time, I would say that there is.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1157 has but two purposes. The first of these is to provide clear legislative authority for the retention in the Ryukyus Islands of funds which are today retained in the islands and used for governmental purposes there.

The second purpose which the bill will serve is to provide a legislative basis for the making of appropriations for certain essential programs in the Ryukyus Islands.

Now, what is our interest in Okinawa and the other Ryukyus Islands? Well, it is simply this.

We took Okinawa and the other islands during World War II—took them by combat. At that time, the islands were an integral part of Japan.

At the time of the peace treaty with Japan which was ratified by the Senate on April 28, 1952, Okinawa and the other islands were separated from Japan for all administrative purposes.

Article 3 of the treaty between this country and Japan provided that Japan would concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place these islands under its trusteeship with the United States as the sole administering authority, and that pending such disposition "the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands."

Under the treaty, Japan did not renounce all right, title, or claim to the islands but it did confer upon the United States what could be called *de facto* sovereignty.

Ever since that time, there have been really two governments in the Ryukyus. One of them is the GRI, or the Government of the Ryukyus Islands, and the other is our own High Commissioner who is appointed by the Secretary of Defense and who exercises administrative control over the islands.

The Government of the Ryukyus Islands is the local government and is composed completely of people of the Ryukyus.

The GRI is headed by a chief executive who is appointed by the High Commissioner after consultation with representatives of the local legislature. The local legislature consists of a single



House of 29 members who are elected biannually by the various districts in the islands.

Now, the government of the Ryukyu Islands functions in most respects like any local government notwithstanding the fact that the High Commissioner exercises a great deal of veto power over their actions. In the process of running their government, the Ryukyans, of course, have to provide for the public health, schools, road construction, sanitation, and all of the other things any local government must concern itself with.

In order to carry out these activities, it, of course, must have funds. These funds are derived from the normal sources such as taxes, fees, fines, and such. These will total about \$22.5 million for this year. This is their money and they spend it on the governmental functions that I have described.

Now, it is section 2 of the bill which deals with the government of the Ryukyu Islands, the funds which it collects from taxes and so forth and spends for governmental purposes. This money, of course, is all retained in the islands and under the bill will continue to be retained in exactly the same fashion. The reason for section 2 is to give sound legislative authority for the situation which presently exists under the authority of the treaty with Japan. Section 2 does not change anything. It merely gives an existing situation a firm basis in legislative authority.

Section 3 of the bill deals with what I will call the extension of our own Government in the Ryukyus. This is the government headed by the High Commissioner who is also the military commander. His organization also derives certain funds from its governmental activities. These activities are set out in section 3 and include public benefit trusts, business type operations, corporations, fines, fees, and so forth. These will total about \$3 million this year.

Now, these funds—except for about \$50,000—are today retained in the Ryukyus and are used for those aspects of the High Commissioner's governmental operations.

So, again, section 3, except in a very minor respect, relating to about \$50,000 a year, does not change the existing situation at all but does in this instance, too, give a sound legislative basis for a situation which has existed many years. Here, also, the source of the authority so far has been the treaty between our Government and Japan.

Section 4 of the bill, although it might appear on its face to be somewhat unusual, is nothing but legislative authority which will serve as a basis for the making of appropriations by the Congress in an amount not to exceed \$6 million each year for the purposes enumerated in the bill itself. That is to say, promoting the economic development of the islands, reimbursing the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for our Armed Forces, and emergency purposes relating to typhoons or other disasters in the islands.

Now, that is all that the bill does. It merely provides sound, well considered basic authority for what is going on today on the one hand and providing clear legislative authority for the making of appropriations for the purposes I have just described.

I have thought it unnecessary to deal with our prime interest in Okinawa and the other islands since this is a matter well known to the Members of this House. It is our most important military base in the Far East and one in which we have invested a very great amount of money. We have been there for a good many years and we will be there for a good many more years to come. Everyone from the President down agrees to this fact and for those who would wish to see from official statements to this effect, I will refer them to pages 9, 10, and 11 of the committee report which provides abundant support for our continued tenure in that part of the world.

This bill is wholly sound legislation and has the approval of the responsible civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense and of the Bureau of the Budget.

I urge support of this bill as one additional step toward the maintenance of our defensive and offensive military power in the Far East.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], the chairman of the committee that handled this legislation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the 5 minutes because the bill has been well explained by the two gentlemen from Illinois.

When this bill came to our subcommittee I was a little bit worried about it, but the committee went into it thoroughly. After studying it, I felt that it was something that should have been done several years ago because under the present procedure, as you can see from reading the bill and the report and the hearings, they are using these funds received from taxes, fines, and forfeitures without authority from the Congress or without any auditing by the General Accounting Office. This bill requires that they get authority from the Appropriations Committee and it also requires auditing by the General Accounting Office.

The income from these funds runs to something like \$9 million a year. Of course the people out there wanted, I believe, \$7 or \$8 million. We authorized \$6 million and put the control back in the hands of the Congress, where it should have been in the beginning. Not only does this have to be handled by the Committee on Appropriations but also checked by the General Accounting Office, which is nothing but sound procedure.

If you will refer to the map on the back of the report and look at the position of Okinawa and the Ryukyus and their strategic position, I believe you will agree that they are the most important islands we are holding today in this troubled world. I do not think we can change that very much at the present time.

Another important factor is that this particular area has the highest density of population of any place in the world. I believe it is 1,000 people or more to every square mile, which is a very high density of population in a section like that. So it is important that we try to stabilize and at least help them as much as they were helped by the Japanese Government, because they were appropriating money there to take care of the population before we ever took the islands. So in effect it is what has been done there for many years.

If you will look at the hearings at page 3997, you will notice this is one place that we have been reducing the cost. It has gone down and down every year. We are not spending anywhere near the \$6 million and we will not spend that this year. I believe it is something like \$1,500,000 or \$2 million this year that has been agreed to by the High Commissioner and the authorities there to be spent. So, all in all, I think this bill is a good bill. I think it is a sound measure and one that is in the interest of our national security. We feel this is the right thing to do in the treatment of these people. Also, I think in the long run we are getting out much cheaper than we are getting out in many other parts of the world. The people are growing in stability and they are growing in economic wealth. They are trying to do something and they are doing something. I believe their total budget expenditure runs to something like \$30 million a year.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, Do I understand correctly that the Ryukyu Islands are being administered under a United Nations trusteeship?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No. They are being administered by the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Does the United Nations have anything to do with the administration of the Ryukyus?

Mr. PRICE. No.

Mr. GROSS. I thought somebody said the United Nations was involved.

Mr. PRICE. You may be referring to the statement in the report on the bill which reads as follows:

Under the terms of article 3 of the treaty, Japan agreed that it would concur in any proposal of the United States to the U.N. to place these islands, as well as certain others, under its trusteeship with the United States as sole administering authority and that pending such disposition "the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands."

Mr. GROSS. What have we been paying for the administration of the Ryukyus out of the U.S. Treasury?

Mr. PRICE. Since 1947 we have been appropriating as high as \$50 million, down to a million dollars a year.

Mr. GROSS. Is that for the civil administration of the islands?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, and all the matters connected with such administration.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include the building of a powerplant, or was there anything extraordinary involved in the way of expenditure where the figure was \$50 million?

Mr. PRICE. This is all for the purposes set out in the bill, including "promoting the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands and improving the welfare of the inhabitants thereof; reimbursing the government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for the benefit of and by reason of the presence of the Armed Forces of the United States within the Ryukyu Islands, including but not limited to reimbursement for such services in the fields of public health and safety," and so on.

Mr. GROSS. This is interesting. How did that come from \$50 million down to \$1 million?

Mr. PRICE. Immediately after the war great expenditure had to be made because of the great devastation there.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the tax revenue from the natives or local citizens has increased to make up the difference?

Mr. PRICE. That is part of it.

Mr. GROSS. Where else do we divert income tax money as proposed in this bill?

Mr. PRICE. I have a whole list of places here. We did it in the Philippines; we do it in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, Samoa, and we do it in many other instances. There are at least 20 or 25 instances where we have done it. They are fully listed in the report and in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. We have sufficient American citizens there to accumulate \$6 million in Federal income taxes?

Mr. PRICE. They collect more than that; they collect on an average of \$9 million a year in income taxes alone.

Mr. GROSS. That is paid mostly by military personnel, is it not?

Mr. PRICE. Almost all. There are a few American businessmen there, but mostly it is military.

Mr. GROSS. There are more people there than I suspected.

Mr. PRICE. Yes; it is one of our biggest and most important installations in the Far East.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I would remind the gentleman that this bill provides a sound legislative basis for our operations in the Ryukyus. This bill also places a limit of \$6 million on any annual appropriation; they cannot exceed that.

Mr. GROSS. Then do I understand correctly that the expenditures must be approved by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct; we appropriate it here in Congress, and the authorization for that is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. There is no other way by which the appropriations can be made?

Mr. DURHAM. No; and the activities dealt with in section 3 have to be audited by the General Accounting Office, I might mention.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in the exercise by the President of the authority over the Ryukyu Islands granted the United States by article 3 of the treaty of peace with Japan, every effort shall be made to improve the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and to promote their economic and cultural advancement, during such time as the United States continues to retain authority over the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 2. All fines, fees, forfeitures, taxes, assessments, and any other revenues received by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands shall be covered into the treasury of the Ryukyu Islands and shall be available for expenditure by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 3. Revenues derived by the United States civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands from the following sources shall be deposited in separate funds, which are hereby authorized to be established by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, and shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with annual budget programs approved by the President:

(a) Public-benefit trusts, business-type operations, funds, and enterprises established by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, or its predecessor agencies;

(b) Corporations wholly or partly owned by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Island; and

(c) Fines, fees, and forfeitures received by the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 4. Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall ascertain, from information furnished by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, the amount of Federal income taxes withheld at the source during the fiscal year, under the internal revenue laws of the United States, from persons stationed or employed in the Ryukyu Islands. An amount equivalent to that so determined, less the estimated amount of refunds and credits, and not to exceed \$6,000,000 in any fiscal year, is hereby appropriated to the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands. Such appropriations shall be credited to a separate account to be established by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, and shall be available for obligation and expenditures, in accordance with programs approved by the President, for: (a) promoting the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands and improving the welfare of the inhabitants thereof; (b) reimbursing the Government of the Ryukyu Islands for services performed for the benefit of and by reason of the presence of the Armed Forces of the United States within the Ryukyu Islands, including but not limited to reimbursement for such services in the fields of public health and safety, in annual amounts which may be paid in advance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; and (c) emergency purposes related to typhoons or other disasters in the Ryukyu Islands. Preference shall be given to programs in which the Government of the Ryukyu Islands participates by sharing part of the costs of contributing other resources. Any unobligated balance in the account in excess of \$6,000,000 at the end of any fiscal

year shall be transferred and paid over to the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated by the Congress of the United States such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The term "Ryukyu Islands," as used in this Act, means Nansel Shoto south of twenty-nine degrees north latitude, excluding the islands in the Amami Oshima group with respect to which all rights and interests of the United States under article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan have been relinquished to Japan.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to extend the application of any law of the United States to the Ryukyu Islands which would not otherwise be applicable there.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 2, strike the word "appropriated" and insert the words "set aside".

On page 3, line 3, strike the word "appropriations" and insert the word "credits".

On page 3, line 4, strike the words "credited to" and insert the words "kept in".

On page 3, line 6, following the comma after "expenditure" insert the following: "within such limitations as may be provided hereafter in appropriations acts".

On page 3, line 20, strike "of" and insert "or".

Page 4, following line 12, insert a new section 8 as follows:

"SEC. 8. All financial transactions of the United States civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such administration, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950, as amended. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by such administration, agencies or instrumentalities, and necessary to facilitate the audit. This section does not apply to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, pursuant to House Resolution 533, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.



The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### BENT'S OLD FORT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, May 19 last, the committee amendment had been agreed to and all debate under the 5-minute rule on the bill and all amendments thereto was limited to 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is legislation that would authorize the addition of Bent's Old Fort as a historic site of the national park system. This project has been given satisfactory approval by those having the responsibility for determining the values of such historic places. They have suggested that the legislation is worth while and that this particular facility would fit nicely into our national park system. We debated the legislation at some length last Thursday. I sincerely hope that the bill receives the approval of the House.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill which establishes Bent's Old Fort as a national historic site is a meritorious bill. This legislation has a favorable report from the Department of the Interior, and was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Public Lands, and by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. Chairman, this site was checked by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, and was approved by the Board for designation as a national historic site. As I mentioned in the debate on this bill last week, I feel that Bent's Old Fort has such historical significance and importance that it is entitled to this consideration.

I have tried to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that it may be possible for the Federal Government to acquire the additional land adjacent to the site without cost. I shall certainly do what I can to obtain this land for the National Park Service without expense to the Government.

I again urge the House to pass this bill. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Has all time expired on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6851, pursuant to House Resolution 509, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously made in the House, further proceedings on this bill will go over until Wednesday.

Does the gentleman insist on his point of order under those circumstances?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman just make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. GROSS. I am objecting to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is no unanimous consent that we do not have a yea-and-nay vote on it; is there?

The SPEAKER. There has been such in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the House?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I understood that applied only to a certain day. I did not understand it applied forever, to all yea-and-nay votes.

The SPEAKER. The unanimous-consent agreement was entered into late last week that that would obtain today and tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say, there is no way to get a yea-and-nay vote on any of these bills if they come up today?

The SPEAKER. Not today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Or tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Or tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that is certainly a strange sort of unanimous-consent proposition.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GROSS. No, Mr. Speaker; I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the vote will go over until Wednesday. If the gentleman insists on his point of order of no quorum, it will have no effect except to get a quorum, but there will not be any vote on the bill.

Mr. GROSS. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

#### LAND TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8226, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday last, May 19, committee amendments had been agreed to. All debate on the bill and all amendments thereto were limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill refers to improvements in one of our best and most visited facilities of the National Park Service. The old fort at St. Augustine, Fla., is involved. The proposed improvements are necessary so that the old and renewed place can be visited easily and receive the attention by the visiting public that it deserves. This legislation is necessary and timely. I trust that my colleagues will give their unanimous support to the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida, pursuant to House Resolution 510, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INACCURATE STATEMENTS ON FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial and a news feature article published in this morning's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald make such inaccurate and distorted statements relative to me with reference to the appropriation for foreign aid—and at a time when truth and objectivity are especially needed in dealing with public affairs—that I believe it is well for me to remind the House at this time that these misrepresentations are groundless, completely without foundation in fact.

I have for a number of years been, and now am, the target of a barrage of uninformed attacks and unwarranted pressures, emanating from many and varied sources, both from within and from without the Government. So I say to you now that I can, and will, prove the validity of my stand—even to the doubting ones, if they will only listen—when the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal 1961 is brought to the House floor.

My position on foreign aid needs no defense; it needs only to be understood. I have lived with this monstrosity as chairman of the subcommittee handling the money bill for 6 turbulent years, and for 2 additional years prior to that as a member of the subcommittee. If those in high authority would only find the time to listen patiently, with open minds, while unrefuted facts are revealed, they would then readily admit that the amount of funds requested should be drastically and permanently reduced.

There are numerous instances in which we are now supporting governments that are operating with substantial surpluses; and the only justification offered is that we are giving this money not for economic reasons, but for political purposes. It is admitted that we are being subjected to political blackmail.

Many programs and literally hundreds of projects are being started for which no testimony has ever been presented, justification made, or authorization given by or before the committees of the Congress. Some of these undertakings commit us as far ahead as 1975 with obligations which, if carried to a conclusion, would require the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars.

When the bill is brought to the House floor for debate, I will do my best to acquaint the Members and the public with as many phases as I can, within the time limitations, of many of the deplorable conditions prevailing. Meantime, I urge that the Members personally study the thousands of printed pages of the record of our subcommittee's hearings, copies of which should be available by month's end.

There is nothing personal, Mr. Speaker, about my efforts to reduce the spending for foreign aid which, in all of its phases, is costing our country considerably more than \$10 billion a year; but I am convinced that just as surely as night follows day, this program will wreck the economic structure and future well-being of our Nation if allowed to continue unchecked and uncontrolled. My conclusions are based upon factual evidence, and not the unsupported wishes of dreamers and schemers.

I stand on this statement, and can prove its validity. I am confident that I will so prove it when the bill is considered by the House.

May I request your further indulgence in order to express my belief that as long as there is world tension there will be incidents which cause emotional upsets. The knowledge that this is so should fortify us, I believe, in our position that unjustified, unproductive funds, wastefully used, should not be provided for worldwide spending programs. We should guard at all times, and particularly so now, against letting our emotions commit us to poorly planned and unrealistic undertakings.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, once again the question of Federal aid for education has been brought to a focal point of attention. As in past years, there are many individuals and groups pressuring the Congress to enact legis-

lation and appropriate large sums for aid to our public schools. And, as in past years, their thesis is that problems which now face American education are of such magnitude that they can be solved only by a substantial investment of Federal money.

The matter has been discussed and legislation attempted at several sessions since I came to Congress in 1953. I shall not attempt to enumerate the bills that have been proposed in past sessions, before or since I came to Congress, nor shall I cite their fate. Suffice to say that several hundred bills were introduced over the period from 1871 to 1949, to authorize Federal financial assistance for the general support of elementary and secondary schools. A few succeeded in passing either the Senate or the House, but none was ever enacted into law. In more recent years, the Federal aid bills have shifted emphasis to school construction. This is true of H.R. 10128 soon to be considered by the House. If enacted, this would serve only as a prelude to additional Federal aid for teachers' salaries and other educational purposes. In fact, during this session, the Senate passed, on February 4, S. 8, an act "to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction and teachers' salaries" following almost 3 days of continuous debate, and this bill is now before the House Committee on Education and Labor. One need only read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 3, and 4 to see the interest and diversity of opinion which the question of Federal aid to education has aroused in the other body. The matter is of equal interest in the House, where we are now ready to consider same.

Emerging from the testimony to date on this very important subject is the fact that proponents and opponents of Federal aid for education equally share the desire for a public school system in America which shall be second to none. The method of securing and maintaining such a system seems to be the very crux of the question. There are wide variations as to the extent of need.

Proponents of Federal aid urge forcefully that only by substantial Federal grants can the Nation's schools be maintained and prepared to serve the present generation adequately while readying future generations for their respective responsibilities in a space age.

Mr. Chairman, I propose, if given the opportunity when we discuss H.R. 10128, to offer an amendment which I believe would provide substantial assistance to the schools of our Nation and which would eliminate once and for all the threats implied by and inherent in Federal control of an educational system.

My amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That 1 per centum of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.



"Sec. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an amount equal to 1 per centum of the taxes from individual and corporate income collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

"Sec. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received."

I consider myself among those who have an overwhelming fear of Federal control of education. It is my sincere belief that magnificent progress has been made in the past decade to overcome deficiencies that developed in our public school system over the war years, and I believe we have the most all-inclusive and representative system of education in the world. Having said this, I would add that there is still room for improvement, and that improvement lies in avenues which finances alone cannot reach.

This Congress, in my opinion, must act wisely in the evolution of Federal aid programs, and must look beyond immediate education needs into the far future. Such a forward look can reveal only one picture if we promote an unwise program of Federal financing of education: there will inevitably follow a gradual loss of State and local responsibility for the schools, with a consequent gradual gain of control over the schools and their programs by a centralized body.

In laying the predicate for my amendment, I should like to review as briefly as possible some of the more controversial aspects of the question of Federal aid for educational purposes so that it may be clearly seen in what respects my proposal differs from others that have been introduced on this important subject, and the manner in which I believe hitherto irreconcilable issues may be reconciled.

Among the first questions raised in regard to Federal aid to education are:

First. What is the extent of Federal responsibility for education under the provisions of the U.S. Constitution?

Second. What is the extent of State responsibility under the State constitution?

Third. What precedent do we have for or against Federal aid for educational purposes?

First. Answering the first of these questions, there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution which makes education a Federal function. We are a Nation of 50 sovereign and independent States operating under a Constitution which reserves to them or the people thereof all powers not delegated to the Central Government. To embark on a program of Federal subsidization of education is tantamount to abandoning the principle of States rights and ignoring the constitutional provision that "powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the

States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Second. Nearly all State constitutions have education clauses making public education the concern and responsibility of the State and local communities thereof.

Third. Proponents of Federal aid support their views by pointing to "historical precedents" for such action including the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act; the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education; the national school lunch program; assistance to schools in federally impacted areas; the GI bills for World War II and Korean war veterans; and, more recently, the National Defense Education Act. They argue that these programs have operated with a minimum of Federal control and with maximum efficiency and contend that the principle for Federal educational aid having already been established, the enactment of additional legislation at this time looking toward alleviating the national education needs would in no way violate our Constitution nor invite Federal controls with unfavorable consequences.

What the proponents fail to observe is that the foregoing programs have not been related to general education, but rather to grants of land or money for the development of certain study areas, for child health programs, or to fulfill definite responsibilities which were a direct result of Federal activity. The Federal Congress has resisted for nearly a century other types of Federal aid legislation which might directly or indirectly influence the minds and thinking of American youth. In this respect, I fervently pray that the Congress will continue to resist.

Next, we come to questions relating to the financing of school needs such as, first, do the States have the fiscal capacity to take care of school needs?

Second. What resources does the Federal Government have which are beyond the reach of the States?

Third. Which has expanded its indebtedness and tax collection more within the past 30 years—the Federal Government or the State and local governments?

First. In response to the first question, proponents of Federal aid claim that schools are woefully underfinanced and that States and local communities are either unwilling or cannot provide adequate taxation to meet ever-growing needs; that only by intervention of the Federal Government, with its superior taxing powers, will a sufficient share of the Nation's income be allocated to educational needs, and thus avert a national calamity.

Recent statistics of the U.S. Office of Education show that in the past two decades enrollments in educational institutions increased 56 percent while educational expenditures increased 642 percent. In considering these figures we must be mindful of the fact that during the period prices more than doubled, but even then a 56 percent enrollment was accompanied by an increase in educational expenditures of 253 percent

computed in dollars of constant purchasing power. The comparative tabulation follows:

*Educational expenditures and enrollment, 1940-60*

School year	Expenditures	Enrollment
	Thousands	
1939-40.....	\$3,199,593	29,751,203
1949-50.....	8,795,635	31,319,271
1955-56.....	16,811,651	39,103,059
1959-60.....	24,000,000	46,480,000
	Percent	Percent
Increase, 1940-60.....	642	56

The percent of national income devoted to education has increased from 3.7 percent in 1930 to 6 percent in 1960, with expenditures for education increasing from \$3.2 billion for the school year 1929-30 to \$22 billion for the school year 1958-59, a net increase of 580 percent. By contrast, national income increased for the same period from \$87.8 billion to \$366.2 billion, a net increase of 317 percent. The comparative tabulations follow:

*Educational expenditures and national income, 1929-58*

	Calendar year 1929 or school year 1929-30	Calendar year 1958 or school year 1958-59	Increase
Expenditures for education.....	Billions \$3.2	Billions \$22.0	+580
National income.....	87.8	366.2	+317
Educational expenditures as percent of national income.....	Percent 3.7	Percent 6.0	-----

These figures would seem to indicate an almost phenomenal support of education according to our traditional State and local pattern. Since the end of World War II, the American people have spent \$19 billion for public-school buildings. They have spent this, moreover, with very little Federal aid—only \$300 million, or less than 2 percent, has been provided by the U.S. Government, which has gone largely for buildings in federally impacted areas.

I am exceedingly proud of the achievements of my own State of Florida where great educational gains have been noted along with other types of growth. I should like to insert in the RECORD a table showing the expenditures of the State of Florida for public education from kindergarten to 2 years on the junior college level, from 1955-56 to 1958-59, and estimates for the biennium 1959-61. The figures show that State and county expenditures for public schools in 1956 amounted to nearly \$185 million whereas the estimated expenditures for 1961, that is the last year of the biennium, will be approximately \$374 million. You will note that in a period of 5 years the expenditures have doubled. I say this is a remarkable record. This is a record that shows how my great State of Florida has decided, in every way it knows how, to accept its just and proper responsibility in the field of public education. I am sure most of the other States have a comparable significant record of achievement.

*State of Florida: State and county expenditures for public schools (grades K-14) 1955-56 to 1958-59 and estimates for the biennium 1959-61*

	Actual expenditures				Appropriations and estimated expenditures	
	1955-56	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
<b>Operations:</b>						
Minimum foundation program, public schools:						
Instructional salaries.....	\$73,494,358	\$80,050,317	\$104,251,934	\$106,391,602	\$118,423,914	\$128,392,813
Transportation.....	3,808,810	3,901,858	4,230,371	4,276,402	4,298,605	4,525,933
Other current expense.....	7,349,426	7,977,906	8,872,721	11,866,435	9,950,475	10,761,663
Total, minimum foundation program, public schools.....	84,652,594	91,930,081	117,355,026	122,534,439	132,672,994	143,680,409
Minimum foundation program, junior colleges:						
Instructional salaries.....	(1)	(1)	1,090,049	1,925,259	2,924,117	3,813,900
Other current expense.....	(1)	(1)	187,513	350,630	477,415	622,931
Total, minimum foundation program, junior colleges.....	(1)	(1)	1,277,562	2,275,889	3,400,532	4,436,831
Minimum foundation program, State supervisory service.....	132,819	136,891	158,080	168,700	203,450	203,450
Minimum foundation program, sales tax distribution to county schools (to enable counties to match State salary and building funds).....	0	0	18,000,000	16,633,636	21,078,794	21,493,926
Purchase of textbooks.....	1,859,432	2,340,450	2,290,872	2,635,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Public school driver educational fund.....	0	410,749	559,094	649,500	701,970	777,570
Total State funds for operations.....	86,644,845	94,818,171	139,640,634	144,897,164	160,557,740	173,092,186
<b>Capital outlay:</b>						
Minimum foundation program, \$400 per unit from motor vehicle license fees:						
Public schools.....	10,360,028	11,945,673	13,012,607	14,165,560	15,079,264	16,891,200
Junior colleges.....	(1)	(1)	115,980	212,472	259,920	347,200
Additional capital outlay, \$200 per pupil increase in ADA.....	0	0	11,479,602	10,054,243	14,140,000	13,360,000
Additional junior college capital outlay.....	4,197,652	0	2,003,586	2,529,582	5,540,971	(2)
Total, State funds for capital outlay.....	14,557,680	11,945,673	26,611,775	26,961,857	35,021,155	30,598,400
Total State funds for public schools and junior colleges.....	101,202,525	106,763,844	166,252,409	171,859,021	195,577,895	203,690,586
<b>County effort:</b>						
Minimum foundation requirement.....	21,677,389	23,167,955	26,086,067	31,469,695	38,462,538	42,308,793
Additional county effort.....	61,908,409	72,214,290	85,485,294	98,530,305	117,537,462	127,691,207
Total, county effort.....	83,585,798	95,382,245	111,571,361	130,000,000	156,000,000	170,000,000
Total, support of Florida public schools and junior colleges.....	184,788,323	202,146,089	277,823,770	301,859,021	351,577,895	373,690,586

<sup>1</sup> Junior college funds were included in minimum foundation program-public schools calculations prior to 1957-58.

<sup>2</sup> For biennium.

Source: Budget Director's Office, July 7, 1959.

The State superintendent of public instruction for Florida, in commenting on the 1959 legislative actions, stated:

Financing of public schools was given top priority throughout the session, and an examination of the entire scope of the legislative action pertaining to public schools indicates that education received fair and equitable treatment by the 1959 legislature. The needs of grades 1-12 in the minimum foundation program were met in full, as requested and estimated by the State department of education. No program was eliminated and no program was cut below its current level.

State matching funds for school construction were increased. Additional construction was provided for existing community junior colleges and provision was made for starting needed new community junior colleges \* \* \*.

Allocation of teacher training scholarships was placed on an up-to-date enrollment basis. The summer enrichment program was broadened to include the teaching of academic subjects \* \* \*.

And, equally as important, no legislation which would be considered harmful or detrimental to the future of the public free school system was enacted into law.

To the above, I should like to add that the combined annual budgets for the institutions of higher learning in the State of Florida for the identical periods increased commensurately, as shown by the following figures:

The combined operating expenditures of State supported institutions of higher learning for 1955-56 amounted to \$28,194,172. Budgeted for 1960-61 are \$50,525,884, an overall increase of \$22,331,712. These figures are exclusive

of auxiliary enterprises, debt service on revenue certificates or building construction. This is nearly a 90 percent increase in 4 years.

Second. The second portion of the larger question of finances relating to resources of the Federal Government may be answered simply: The Government, of itself, has no funds beyond those which it extracts from taxpayers. Federal aid would merely mean a substitution of the tax collecting power from the States and/or local governments to the Central Government. All money comes from taxpayers.

Third. In regard to the third phase of the question, namely, "which has expanded its indebtedness and tax collection more in recent years—the Federal or State and local governments?" comparative data indicate that Federal taxes increased more steeply, are now leveled at far higher rates, and have become more burdensome than State and local taxes.

Federal taxes multiplied 20 times between 1927 and 1958, State and local taxes 5 times. The following figures illustrate the relative increase:

*Federal, State, and local taxes for the period 1927-58*

	Federal taxes	State and local taxes
	Billions of dollars	
1927.....	\$3.4	\$6.1
1958.....	68.0	30.4

*Federal, State, and local taxes for the period 1927-58—Continued*

	Federal taxes	State and local taxes
	Percent of national income	
1927.....	4.1	7.4
1958.....	18.6	8.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Historical Summary of Governmental Finances in the United States, 1959", "Governmental Finances in 1958, 1959."

And the following table illustrates the relative debt situation:

*Federal, State, and local debt for the period 1927-58*

	Federal debt	State and local debt
	Billions of dollars	
1927.....	\$18.5	\$14.9
1958.....	276.4	58.2
	Percent of national income	
1927.....	22.6	18.2
1958.....	75.5	15.9

Source: "Federal Debt," report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1958. "State and Local Debt," American Enterprise Association, Inc., Report No. 1, Jan. 15, 1960, pp. 32-33.

In brief, the Federal debt multiplied 15 times between 1927 and 1958, the State and local debt only 4 times. State and local debt declined as a percent of na-



tional income while the burden of the Federal debt multiplied more than three times.

It is claimed that the national debt of the United States now exceeds the combined national debts of all the nations of the world. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it would seem the height of folly to add to the tax burden of the Nation at this time. We should all bear in mind this statement by Chief Justice Marshall:

The power to tax is the power to destroy.

Closely allied to the foregoing major points in the general discussion of finances is this: Is resistance to higher taxes caused by the increasing burdens of Federal taxes or of State and local taxes?

The heavy burden of Federal taxes has certainly adversely affected the fiscal capacity of State and local governments. Federal taxes have preempted the tax field and severely limited the income of State and local governments. As verification for this statement, I call attention to the results of a questionnaire sent out in May 1959 by Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, to Governors of States and territories, in conjunction with the committee's consideration of H.R. 22, School Support Act of 1959. The questionnaire and replies formed a supplemental committee report on H.R. 22. Five questions were asked by the chairman which were deemed pertinent to the problem of financing education. In my opinion, and in the opinion of some of the recipients, they were leading questions premised on the assumption and anticipated conclusions that most of the States would declare their dependency on Federal aid for their educational programs. Three items in particular were stressed in the general accompanying letter:

First. That there seems to be a consensus in the country today concerning "national goals in school financing."

Second. That the States are already straining their tax resources to meet current needs.

Third. That increasing taxpayer resistance means a Federal program to equalize the tax burden at the national level is indispensable.

The five questions propounded are these:

1. Considering the political realities in your State, do you consider it likely or unlikely that the combined efforts of your State legislature and local school districts will increase school appropriations to the point that your State will come reasonably close to the national goals outlined above by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Rockefeller brothers report?

2. Does taxpayer resistance to increased school taxes seem to be increasing or diminishing in your State?

3. Is it realistic to look for increases of at least 5 percent each year in school appropriations by the State legislature during your term of office?

4. Judging by the performance of your legislature during the past 4 years could you predict the percentage that schoolteachers' salaries will be increased in your State in the next 5 years?

5. The following conclusion appeared in the Rockefeller report: "It is the weakness in the State and local taxing systems more than

anything else that gives rise to current proposals for increased Federal support of education. For those who wish to resist or postpone the resort to Federal funds and at the same time not constrict educational services there seems to be only one alternative: a thoughtful, painful, politically courageous overhaul of State and local tax systems." Is such overhaul presently under way in your State?

We are interested in all of these questions, but primarily interested at this point in question No. 2. Many of the Governors quickly distinguished between "taxpayer resistance to increased taxes" as such, and "taxpayer resistance to increased taxes for school purposes." Many acknowledged an increased resistance to all types of taxation, but not specifically to school taxation. When citizens understood the needs for school programs, they generally favored school taxes. The only fly in the ointment seemed to be the dearth of local taxes by virtue of the more lucrative sources of taxation having been usurped by the Federal Government.

Now let us take a look at the interest in and need for so-called Federal aid for education, as well as the financial picture with respect to schools, coming directly from the heads of States, that is, the Governors or their spokesmen.

Nine of those addressed did not even reply. Most of the replies—a total of 25—were noncommittal, merely giving a résumé of the laws affecting the financing of their school systems. The majority seemed to imply that their laws were inadequate. One State, Arkansas, indicated the financial outlook was not good, but expressed no desire for Federal aid. Ten of this noncommittal group indicated excellent financial backing and outlook for their public schools; in some instances the outlook was better than the so-called national goals cited by Chairman BAILEY in his letter. Fourteen were completely noncommittal and merely cited their laws.

Many Governors objected to the assumption underlying the proposed questions, namely, what actually constituted national goals. The Governor of Virginia criticized the questions as "too limited in source and number to constitute a solid basis for assuming that they represent a consensus for national goals, and any attempt to broaden the source of opinion on this important matter is weakened by requesting answers to specific questions that in themselves stem from a doubtful assumption."

Eight Governors categorically denied any need for Federal aid and were strongly opposed to same.

Four Governors only came out strongly for Federal aid: Alaska, Michigan, Minnesota, and Nebraska. Alaska as a Territory had always had aid through the Department of the Interior and the transition to statehood would entail difficulties without continued support for the Alaska educational system.

Michigan indicates a bad financial situation, though one is left to wonder if the cause is political or financial. In any event, she would favor Federal aid. Nebraska seems to be in a desperate plight and would favor relief. Minnesota thinks it could do a better educational job with Federal aid.

Three additional States have no real objection to Federal aid: Colorado does not need help, but does not object to Federal aid; Maryland and North Carolina prefer local and State control, but are not especially opposed to Federal aid even though they do not need it.

Lastly, there are several States outspoken against Federal aid to education. These include Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Carolina, Virginia, and Texas. Comments of some of the governors are enlightening:

The Governor of Iowa says:

The mechanism of Federal aid to education will not make available economic resources not already available to the various States and the local political subdivisions financing public school systems in this country.

The Governor of Indiana says:

Excellent local support has been given to public education in Indiana.

And he points out that:

Americans have always regarded public education as the particular province of local communities, and history has demonstrated that when the people lose control of the education of their children—and vest it in one centralized authority or bureau—that socialism, nazism, fascism, and communism can more easily gain control of the government with the immediate and complete loss of individual freedom.

The Governor of Kansas says:

In a moment of hysteria, it is possible that the country may be stampeded into action that will destroy further the traditional responsibilities of local governments in providing for the educational needs of the citizens. \* \* \* It is my opinion that given anywhere equal opportunity the local and State governments are better able to solve educational problems than are members of a Federal bureaucracy.

The Governor of Montana says:

Rather than being trapped by a loaded question of the "when did you stop beating your wife?" variety, I would like to point out that, in my opinion, as Governor of Montana, that the educational needs of Montana and Montanans are best determined by those at the local and State levels, rather than from a distant office in Washington or New York.

The Governor, incidentally, gives a remarkable picture of support at the State level in Montana.

The Governor of North Dakota says that with appropriate tax overhauling "we would not need Federal aid for education. I consider it likely that the combined efforts of our State legislature and local school districts will increase local school appropriations to continue the advancement of and improvement in public education. Taxpayer resistance seems to be decreasing as far as school support is concerned."

The Governor of South Carolina says:

I would like to say we are very proud of our program and we propose to continue that program through State efforts. Two years ago the special Presidential Commission studying the so-called national emergency in public schooling found that in only 13 States in America is a child not being denied an education for the lack of a classroom or a schoolteacher. Low per capita income South Carolina is one of these 13. We do not want Federal aid. We do not need Federal aid.

The Governor of Virginia, among other things, says:

Virginia is recognized nationally for its sound fiscal policy in governmental affairs. \* \* \* Despite the fact that Federal programs in health, welfare, and the like have required matching funds locally to such an extent that the residual resources have correspondingly dwindled for education, it would appear wise to reflect carefully before embarking on elaborate Federal aid programs in general education under the guise of national defense. The power of control that inevitably accrues to the holder of the purse string can often be visibly guarded when applied to ships and roads and buildings. It subtly escapes this scrutiny, however, when applied to training the mind of youth in the form of education. \* \* \* It is not the seen enemy we fear half so much as centralized control of the affairs of the mind.

And the Governor of Texas, in quoting from a report of a committee appointed by him says:

The advancement and continuing support of public education is a fundamental obligation of State and local government. A free society must develop its human potential by identifying, nurturing, and wisely using its talents.

In other words, the Governors of the several States, as I analyze their replies as objectively as possible, do not appear to feel the need of Federal aid as legislation presently before this Congress contemplates. Though not asked to specifically comment on their attitudes toward Federal aid for education, many nevertheless spoke out against it and did not even attempt to answer the main questions that were asked them. Many have problems of taxation, but they feel there is no special resistance to taxation when it is known that it is for school purposes. I am sure that all realize that if the Federal Government spent less they would certainly have more to spend on their own respective State services.

Much of the clamor for Federal aid revolves around the alleged problem of classroom shortage and the inability of State and local governments to finance school construction rapidly enough to overcome the present gap and the ever-widening shortages predicted for the foreseeable future. This particular facet of Federal aid is the one selected for primary emphasis at this time and is, indeed, the main purpose of H.R. 10128. If enacted, it would be an opening wedge for the National Government to step into the educational picture. Where this bill calls for a billion dollar appropriation, this would be a mere bagatelle to the billions that would be demanded in the future. Statistics offered in the committee report on H.R. 10128, and in various studies by staunch proponents of Federal aid, are in no way conclusive of the need for Federal aid to alleviate shortages. Here are some of the statistics offered in support of Federal aid, derived from reports of the U.S. Office of Education:

Estimated shortage, 1950, 250,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1953, 312,000 classrooms.

Estimated shortage, 1954, 370,000 classrooms.

Interestingly enough, I understand these figures were obtained on the basis

of a nationwide school facilities survey which cost \$5 million.

In 1956 the Committee for the White House Conference on Education reported the result of its own shortage survey at 198,625 classrooms. During the autumn of 1956, and the 3 succeeding years, the U.S. Office of Education showed the following classroom shortages, as compiled from information furnished by the State departments of education:

Estimated shortage, 1956,	159,000
classrooms.	
Estimated shortage, 1957,	142,300
classrooms.	
Estimated shortage, 1958,	141,900
classrooms.	
Estimated shortage, 1959,	132,400
classrooms.	

According to their own figures, this would represent a reduction in classroom shortage between 1954 and 1959 from 370,000 to 132,000. There is such variation in the reports from the State departments of education that grave doubt has been raised regarding the accuracy of these estimates; however, we may assume that they are indicative of the general overall picture of classroom shortages.

A comparison of classrooms in use with pupil enrollment from surveys made in 1954 and 1959, respectively, shows:

	1954	1959	Increase (+) or reduction (-)
Classrooms in use.....	983,000	1,279,000	+30
Pupil enrollment.....	30,045,000	35,990,000	+20
Pupils per classroom.....	30.6	28.1	-2.5

A recent forecast of classrooms needed for the next decade is 610,000. To take care of an increased enrollment of 8.7 million students, it is alleged that 312,000 new rooms are needed; a backlog hold-over of needs from the 1959 survey is indicated at 132,000 rooms; and for anticipated abandonments which must be replaced, an additional 166,000 will be needed. This would average 61,000 classrooms per year during the decade, whereas classroom construction without any Federal money, averaged 66,700 per year, during the past 5 years. If the States make the same effort during the next decade as they have in the past five, classrooms can be constructed to meet increased needs without any Federal intervention. Moreover, if there is a lessening of State and local support as a result of Federal assistance, the picture would be far less optimistic so far as the final net results are concerned. The American people have spent an average of \$1 billion per year since the end of World War II on school construction. I raise the question: would they continue to make the effort to raise \$1 billion annually for the next 10 years, if the Federal Government enacts a Federal assistance program? I believe the answer to this question would be the same today as that which was given in May 1957 when Time magazine sampled opinion. The May 13, 1957, issue of Time magazine carried the following:

Of all the items in President Eisenhower's domestic program, few seem less likely to

succeed than Federal aid for school construction. But would the defeat of this proposal be as great a calamity as its backers insist? Last week Time surveyed 48 States to find out. The answer: No. Though the Nation as a whole must keep building classrooms faster than ever before, a surprisingly big proportion of the States do not need—or do not want—any help from the Government.

Some of the States which got off to a slow start in meeting their increased classroom needs have now taken positive action in that direction. Alabama may be cited as an example. Last August the State legislature authorized a substantial aid program to be financed by issuance of \$100 million of State bonds. This will take care of two-thirds of the reported existing shortage of classrooms in the State of Alabama. Others are taking similar action.

The minority views included in the committee report on H.R. 10128 point up with great clarity the weaknesses of this bill. They deserve our strictest scrutiny. They complain that "neither the Subcommittee on General Education, nor the full committee, held any public hearings on the subject of this bill, or the bill itself, in the present session of Congress. There is a positive need for such hearings."

The objectivity and reliability of the committee's favorable recommendations are open to question in view of the significant progress that has been made in meeting needs during the past several years, without any Federal aid, and the relative decline in backlog estimates. The minority wisely states the obvious, namely, that "no adequate and effective program of Federal aid can properly ignore the rapidly shifting patterns of need and response which have taken place in education in this country."

With specific reference to backlogs, page 16 of the report states:

We do not question the existence of some backlog. We do believe, however, that there is and will continue to be an irreducible minimum backlog of classroom need, regardless of any question of Federal aid. To the extent this exists, and for other reasons discussed later in this report, the urgency of the presumed classroom shortage is considerably diminished.

On page 18, the report further states:

It is also evident that the construction peak has been crossed and within 5 years the number of classrooms required to keep fully abreast additional needs will be only half as much each year as actually have been built in the past few years.

Much credence has been given to the distress signals created on the ground of alleged school district debt limitations. Proponents of Federal aid for school construction claim that over the years "more and more school districts have exhausted their resources," and can no longer build their own classrooms. A careful reading of pages 22 and 23 of the minority views on H.R. 10128 show that such districts are an infinitesimal part of the whole; that—

The 237 borrowed-up districts reported in the last survey amount to only six-tenths of 1 percent, or 6 out of every 1,000 of the Nation's 40,000 school districts. The enrollment in these districts is less than 1.5 percent of the U.S. total.



In other words, the fiscal capacity of only a limited number of the 40,000 school districts in the Nation has been exhausted. One member of the committee very aptly raised this question:

Why, indeed, should we spread nearly a thousand million dollars tax money around the country in order to help these districts?

Another weakness pointed to by the minority is that H.R. 10128, if enacted, would allocate funds without regard to need or financial ability to construct schools. It constitutes a sort of Government "payola" whereby the States are led to expect something for nothing, whereas, in reality, none will ever recover what it is compelled to put into the program by way of additional taxation. In fact, many, including some of the poorer of the States, may find themselves in the position of being taxed without any appreciable possibility of recovering on their investment for this reason. Section 7(a) states:

The amount allotted to any State under section 4 for any year shall be reduced by the percentage (if any) by which its State school effort index for such year is less than the national school effort index for such year. The total of such reductions shall be reallocated among the remaining States by proportionately increasing the amounts allotted to them under section 4 for such year.

According, if a poorer State finds itself incapable of raising by legislative enactment enough for maintaining its school system, plus a sum sufficient to meet the "State school effort index" prescribed by this bill, it will in effect be paying taxes to support a program from which it cannot profit.

The bill, by implication, looks to future extensions, for it makes provision for this option:

In lieu of making grants of State funds required under subsection (a), any State which wishes to pay the principal and interest annually becoming due on bonds or other obligations issued to finance school facilities projects may elect to have its allotment (or a designated portion thereof) for any fiscal year made available to it in the form of Federal commitments to pay all of the principal and interest annually becoming due on an equivalent amount of such bonds or other obligations.

Obviously a billion dollar appropriation, spread over 3 years, as contemplated by H.R. 10128, would not be adequate to assist States with bond issues within the life of the bill.

Though H.R. 10128 relates only to Federal aid for school construction, as already indicated, we should not overlook the fact that S. 8, which also includes aid for teachers' salaries, has already passed the Senate and is now pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor. Enactment of H.R. 10128, which is not needed, would be only a prelude to enactment in this session and forever hereafter of vast appropriations not only for school construction purposes but teachers' salaries and other educational purposes. For that reason, the question of Federal aid for teachers' salaries should also be discussed as a component of the general subject.

The matter of teachers' salaries and teacher shortage seems to deserve the

thoughtful attention of every right-minded citizen. I should like to say here that all of my adult life with the exception of 4 years spent in military service during World War II was devoted to the field of education, until I came to Congress in 1953. I was a high school teacher, a high school principal, and I held an administrative office in a university for a total service of 21 years in the cause of education. My home is Gainesville, Fla., the home of the great University of Florida. Some of my closest and dearest friends and associates are engaged in the field of education.

I am well aware of the acute need of better teacher salaries. I know from experience the sacrifice entailed in trying to maintain minimum decent standards of living for one's self and one's family on a teacher's salary. I am aware of the fact that participation in the adventures and uncertainties of the new space age will require greater numbers of technically and scientifically trained personnel. I am aware of the present rapid increases and predicted future increases in the public school enrollments.

Because of my personal interest in the subject of teachers' salaries, I have been pleased to observe the increased and deserved attention given this matter in recent years. Florida enacted a minimum foundation law several years ago which has brought substantial relief by way of increased salaries to our teachers. Although salaries for competent teachers are not yet so adequate as they ought to be, I call attention to the relative increased earnings of teachers as a group, compared with Federal Government employees and other persons working for wages or salaries during the period 1929 to 1958:

*Earnings of teachers and other groups  
1929 and 1958*

	Teachers	All persons working for wages or salaries	Civilian employees of Federal Government
1929 (actual dollars)	\$1,400	\$1,405	\$1,933
1929 (in 1958 dollars)	2,358	2,366	3,255
1958 (actual dollars)	4,792	4,324	5,514
Percent increase in constant dollars	+103	+83	+69

Since the turn of the century there has been a gradual downward trend in the ratio of pupils to teachers in our public schools. During a 60-year period student enrollment increased 132 percent, instructional staff increased 234 percent, and the ratio of pupils to teacher declined by 30 percent, indicating that a sufficiently large number of persons have been attracted to the teaching profession to bring about a constant lowering of pupil-teacher ratios.

During the past decade there has been a substantial increase in the number of college students whose professional choice is directed toward the field of education. Should this favorable trend continue for another decade beginning with 1960, the output of teachers will be doubled, while the annual increase in

school enrollment should be only about half as much as it was in the last half of the decade just ending.

The same question raised in conjunction with the question of Federal assistance for school construction may be asked here: If the Government through a Federal assistance program makes grants to States for teachers' salaries, would the magnificent effort made at the State and local level for insuring more remunerative teachers' salaries be maintained? Would there not be a lessening of local effort when confronted with the reality of Federal aid?

I come now to the crucial point of conflict in the controversial issue of Federal aid for education, and that is Federal control. The fear engendered by the threat of a Federal-controlled system of education is genuine. Aside from the questionable constitutionality of Federal aid for education, the chief obstacle to enactment of such legislation in the past has been an overriding fear of the consequences of Federal control of our educational system. Woodrow Wilson once said that:

The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

I need not remind this Congress that it was the educational control of Germany—of German youth—under the Nazi regime, after Hitler came to power, and the control of all educational media in the Soviet Union after the 1917 Revolution which first conditioned Germany to precipitate a catastrophic world war, and secondly, enabled Russia to threaten increasingly and unceasingly the peace of the world since the end of that war.

Speaking as the father of three children, I fear possible Federal control over the schools of this Nation as much as I do the menace of communism itself. If and when our educational system passes to the Federal Government, the Constitution of these United States, with all of its matchless guarantees of freedom, will be rendered obsolete.

All of the recent bills introduced, relating to the subject under discussion, have tried to allay the underlying fear of Federal control by including a section to this effect:

In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy, determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Let me say emphatically that I believe this particular clause, although representing the sincere sentiments of those who formulated it, is no more than a pious platitude. Whenever you have the type of overall educational support for school construction or teachers' salaries on the Federal level, called for in the Federal aid for education bills, you will inevitably have Federal control.

Management of a Federal aid program, if enacted, would be vested in the Commissioner of Education of the U.S. Office of Education. Two former U.S. Commissioners of Education unequivocally have declared that Federal

aid without Federal control is an illusion. Dr. Jno. J. Tigert, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and president emeritus of the University of Florida—my alma mater—has said:

If we embark upon a program of turning over Federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance, and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control.

Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, another U.S. Commissioner of Education, stated:

On the one hand, we have presented to us arguments that there will be no Federal control accompanying Federal aid. Alongside, we find evidence showing the inadequacy and inequality of education in States able to support a good educational program, and evidence of inefficient or inadequate efforts by these States to eradicate inequality and inefficiency within their borders. If there is to be little or no Federal control accompanying Federal aid, what right have we to expect a major improvement of the education within States under the same leadership that they now have? Thus, if Federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some Federal control.

I realize that times are different and great changes have taken place in our political and economic thinking since these gentlemen spoke out a number of years ago. This fact is dramatically borne out by the following:

When the national defense education bill came up for consideration before the Congress during the close of the 85th Congress in 1958, it was represented as a temporary emergency need specifically related to our defense effort. It was our partial answer to the sputnik launching. But, I fear it was motivated by a more far-reaching objective—eventual Federal support for American education on a large scale. The fears engendered by Russian scientific progress had excellent propaganda value in gaining an entering wedge for such a change in traditional policy, which theretofore had been barred under the impact of sound public opinion. I call attention to remarks of the present U.S. Commissioner of Education, Mr. Lawrence G. Derthick, made on November 24, 1958:

The National Defense Education Act represents a major breakthrough in the area of Federal concern for education. Its impact will be felt for many years to come. Congress has taken a significant step forward in the field of education.

This act was hailed by professional and nonprofessional educators as one of the most important legislative measures of the Congress. But this act is already under severe criticism by many who report "scents of Federal control." According to press reports, widespread dissatisfaction with the act has been expressed by some of the Nation's school administrators. The act has been described as having "Federal control written into it" in spite of honest congressional efforts to the contrary.

The lack of restrictions imposed by the Federal loan funds have, I understand, often set aside well established and smoothly working State programs, and the latter have been replaced by un-

desirable aspects of Federal control which proponents of Federal aid are always insisting will never come to pass.

It is the consensus of opinion among some of the outstanding deans of graduate schools that there is grave danger in the method of awarding fellowships under the act. I fear if the U.S. Office of Education should be given enough money to control 25 percent of the fellowship awards in our universities, and if methods already initiated are continued, our system of graduate education would be forcefully directed and almost exclusively directed from Washington, D.C. Few institutions would care to institute programs which the U.S. Office of Education would fail to support, while meritorious programs would wither from lack of strong students and the competitive incentives which Federal aid provides. Emphasis has been placed by those administering the act on new and expanded graduate programs, leading, it is feared to Federal support of programs of questionable quality in untried situations and in second-rate institutions which presently are unable to provide even the basic support needed for already-established programs.

Speaking at a nationwide convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Dr. Degar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, in outlining experiences that have alerted school men to flaws in what they otherwise considered a welcome act, said:

It has Federal control in it, because there is a Bureau of the Budget, a Bureau which is manned with people who feel their duty is to follow every dollar down to the end. When this situation obtains, there is bound to be Federal control, there is no way to prevent Federal bureaus from following every Federal dollar to the end.

As I have stated before, in my opinion, every American citizen has an obligation to do all in his power to insure an adequate school system for the students of today and tomorrow. In spite of the magnificent progress that we have made, there is a continuing need to do better, to provide more and better facilities, a greater number of better trained teachers, and more adequate compensation for dedicated teachers. Men of good will in this Congress and out are divided on the best ways to meet the challenge which an adequate educational system for America poses. We are beset with statistics from the National Education Association, the U.S. Office of Education, the Rockefeller Brothers, and other sources reiterating limiting factors in our educational system. A sort of national inferiority complex has developed because of reported educational advances made in the Soviet Union in recent years. Much of the pressure now on Congress stems, I fear, from the propaganda value which long-time proponents of Federal aid have derived from visitors' reports on Russian education. I do not believe we should be pressured by fear into actions that may have a disastrous effect on our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment about which I talked at the beginning of my remarks is not altogether new in con-

cept. A similar amendment has been introduced in previous years. My amendment, in brief, would provide that 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes be returned to the States and territories within which it is collected for use for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

The amendment I propose would meet, I sincerely believe, the many and significant objections that have been raised to Federal aid for education bills that have been introduced in successive congressional sessions. It would provide substantial additional assistance for school purposes in the simplest sort of way. While it might not initially provide the resources envisioned by some of the bills that have been introduced, it is conceivable that, with any attenuation in the defense or military needs of the Nation, the amounts returned to the States would more than take care of their increasing educational needs. I could wish, too, that my bill, if enacted, might establish a precedent whereby, in the future, there would be a return of additional tax funds to the States with an accompanying return of programs which rightfully are the responsibility of the States.

My amendment, if enacted, would first of all provide a large measure of aid for education without additional taxation. Any increase of Federal taxes or in the Federal debt, which would be necessary to finance other proposals now before the Congress, would be prevented.

Second. It would definitely not contribute to the socialization of our educational system.

Third. It would require no additional Federal agency, nor extension of any existing Federal bureaucracy to handle the remittances to the various States.

Fourth. The distribution would be fair and just, because a State would receive funds in proportion to Federal income tax collections within it. By making this specific money available at a time of need, State efforts to meet the demands of their own educational programs might be encouraged while the avenues of Federal control, as already pointed out, would be eliminated.

Fifth. There is a precedent for earmarking certain Federal tax collections. Congress has for several years directed that funds equal to revenues from certain taxes shall be made available to the States for designated purposes, that is to say, proceeds of excise taxes on firearms, shells, and cartridges are used for wildlife restoration, and excise taxes on fishing rods, and so forth, for fish restoration and management projects; and certain Federal tax collections in Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa are now made available for the exclusive use of such possessions.

Sixth. One of the greatest arguments that proponents of a gigantic aid program for education have is that the Federal Government has appropriated to itself all of the so-called attractive tax raising sources such as the income tax. What I propose would take some of that



income tax and give it back to the States to use exactly as they want to use it in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment, if enacted into law, would give us a saner approach to the fiscal problems of this Nation. It would make us realize that money does not grow on trees and, if we appropriate money in Washington, we are going to have to raise the money from the people of the respective States. I sincerely believe that my amendment would meet with general approval for if it were enacted it would effectively stay the hand of reckless spending and the inevitable Federal control that would come as a result of other measures now before the Congress.

I am sure that I speak for a vast number of our citizens when I say that we should keep our hands completely off a vast new program of Federal aid for education. With increased local citizen interest in education, and accelerated State efforts on behalf of the schools, we shall find each citizen doing his own part in support of education. In this manner current demands will be met and foundations for the future soundly laid. The success of the public school system of America depends, after all, upon the participation, interest, and support of all citizens in every community of the Nation. The work of the State and local governments in education has, in the past, given us an educational system unequalled in the world. These same efforts can yet best serve us if we but allow them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the amounts of tax money to be returned to the States for educational purposes, in the event my amendment is passed. The statistics are for 1958; the amounts for 1960 would, of course, be much greater. I earnestly appeal to each of you to vote for this amendment and to avoid the evils of Federal control of education and the useless pyramiding of our Federal debt:

State or region	Income tax collections, fiscal 1958 <sup>1</sup>	1 percent of tax collected
Alaska.....	\$41,531,000	\$415,310
Alabama.....	473,419,000	4,734,190
Arizona.....	224,899,000	2,248,990
Arkansas.....	174,185,000	1,741,850
California.....	5,891,243,000	58,912,430
Colorado.....	824,622,000	8,246,220
Connecticut.....	1,240,454,000	12,404,540
Delaware.....	771,539,000	7,715,390
Florida.....	991,644,000	9,916,440
Georgia.....	743,900,000	7,439,000
Idaho.....	129,181,000	1,291,810
Illinois.....	5,647,218,000	56,472,180
Indiana.....	1,456,282,000	14,562,820
Iowa.....	585,562,000	5,855,620
Kansas.....	489,738,000	4,897,380
Kentucky.....	535,661,000	5,356,610
Louisiana.....	609,711,000	6,097,110
Maine.....	180,880,000	1,808,800
Maryland and District of Columbia.....	1,580,683,000	15,806,830
Massachusetts.....	1,987,301,000	19,873,010
Michigan.....	4,610,879,000	46,108,790
Minnesota.....	1,124,961,000	11,249,610
Mississippi.....	163,489,000	1,634,890
Missouri.....	1,644,189,000	16,441,890
Montana.....	130,512,000	1,305,120
Nebraska.....	386,909,000	3,869,090
Nevada.....	92,574,000	925,740
New Hampshire.....	142,487,000	1,424,870

<sup>1</sup> Figure used for the total tax collected was obtained by combining figures reported for State income and employment taxes and State corporation income and profit taxes (including tax on business income of exempt organizations).

State or region	Income tax collections, fiscal 1958	1 percent of tax collected
New Jersey.....	2,109,289,000	\$21,092,890
New Mexico.....	149,509,000	1,495,090
New York.....	13,519,459,000	135,194,590
North Carolina.....	823,112,000	8,231,120
North Dakota.....	85,104,000	851,040
Ohio.....	4,728,546,000	47,285,460
Oklahoma.....	607,327,000	6,073,270
Oregon.....	446,569,000	4,465,690
Pennsylvania.....	4,985,558,000	49,855,580
Rhode Island.....	289,145,000	2,891,450
South Carolina.....	274,185,000	2,741,850
South Dakota.....	84,108,000	841,080
Tennessee.....	577,334,000	5,773,340
Texas.....	2,411,953,000	24,119,530
Utah.....	181,184,000	1,811,840
Vermont.....	70,540,000	705,400
Virginia.....	891,945,000	8,919,450
Washington.....	847,471,000	8,474,710
West Virginia.....	314,080,000	3,140,800
Wisconsin.....	1,290,021,000	12,900,210
Wyoming.....	64,075,000	640,750
Hawaii.....	157,330,000	1,573,300
Puerto Rico.....	20,013,000	200,130
Total.....	67,763,510,000	677,635,100

Source: U.S. Treasury Department. Combined statements of receipts, expenditures and balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pp. 116-117.

### KINZUA DAM PROJECT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Subcommittee on Public Works reported out the appropriation bill for 1961. In spite of a rising tide of public concern over the so-called Kinzua Dam project, \$4.53 million is being appropriated for this project in fiscal 1961. The Kinzua Dam will require the flooding of 9,077 acres in the Allegheny Reservation of the Seneca Nation of Indians, cutting the heart out of what is left of Seneca land. It is the general belief that the Kinzua project will ultimately destroy the Seneca Nation by separating them from their beloved lands. For the past 3 years a swelling controversy has raged around the possibility of alternate projects accomplishing as much or more than the Kinzua, without hurting the Seneca Indians. Dr. Arthur Morgan, a former chief engineer for the TVA and a renowned expert in hydraulic engineering, has prepared a thorough comparison of the Kinzua Dam and the alternate Conewango Dam projects. Under unanimous consent, I include Dr. Morgan's analysis in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of all Members:

#### A COMPARISON OF THE KINZUA PLAN AND THE CONEWANGO PLAN FOR CONTROL OF THE UPPER ALLEGHENY RIVER

(Statement presented to the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by Arthur E. Morgan, May 5 and 6, 1959)

There are two proposed methods for controlling the Upper Allegheny River for flood control, and for increasing the low-water flow downstream.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO PROJECTS

The Kinzua plan provides for a dam across the Allegheny River a few miles above Warren, Pa. It would store water during floods, and let it out as soon as possible afterward,

so as to be ready for the next flood. Also, it would store a limited amount of water, claimed by the Corps of Engineers to be 550,000-acre feet, for increasing the low-water flow.

The Conewango plan would divert the flow of the Allegheny River through a 6-mile channel into a large glacial depression, where it would be stored for flood control and for increasing the low-water flow. The regulated low-water flow would pass partly down the Allegheny and partly down the channel of Conewango Creek. In case of a flood too large to be held in the Conewango Reservoir, the excess would be passed through an outlet channel and through control gates to Cattaraugus Creek, and so to Lake Erie.

The Conewango-Cattaraugus site is a rare occurrence in nature. Being out of the ordinary and unexpected, it is not surprising that the possibility was overlooked. Before the last glacial period the Allegheny River flowed north into Lake Erie. The ice of the glacial period dug a big hole, in the same way that it dug the Finger Lakes in New York State, and pushed the earth and rock ahead of it, making a dike which turned the Allegheny River away from Lake Erie and to the Ohio River. If we cut through this dike, and use this glacial hole to store water, we have a reservoir with about three times the capacity of Kinzua. The old Allegheny River channel and South Cattaraugus Creek provide a rock gorge, for much of its distance hundreds of feet deep, to carry away the excess floodwater to Lake Erie. A diversion channel about 5 miles long would carry floodwater from the Conewango Reservoir to this deep-rock gorge, and just before it enters the gorge there would be control works to regulate the flow.

Where the Conewango Creek flows out of this Conewango Reservoir site there would be a relatively small dam, which would control the flow. Here the part of the regulated low-water flow which did not pass directly down the Allegheny River would pass down Conewango Creek, entering the Allegheny at Warren, Pa. Conewango Reservoir would completely protect Warren, Jamestown, and the area between from floods from the upper Conewango Creek. Kinzua would give no protection from floods on the lower Conewango.

Just below where a channel would divert the Allegheny River into Conewango Reservoir there would be a relatively small dam across the Allegheny to prevent any flood water from flowing down the Allegheny. Thus, all floodflows from above that point would be entirely removed from the Allegheny and Ohio Rivers. Most of that floodwater could be stored in Conewango Reservoir for use during low water. In case of unusually large floods the excess would pass down the very large preglacial channel of the Allegheny (Cattaraugus Creek) to Lake Erie. A limited amount of regulated low-water flow should be passed down that channel to take care of a very bad pollution condition on the Cattaraugus Creek.

Most of the Conewango Reservoir site is a great marsh, much of it useless. The margins are used for pasture. Almost no one lives on the marsh, but there are dairy farms and several villages around the edges. There are almost no industries in the locality. It is an economically depressed area. The parts of the villages which would be flooded could be moved up the hill for a fraction of a mile without destroying or disrupting the communities. A permanent lake of at least 28 square miles would be created, with all its recreational and economic advantages.

I shall have time here to present only a summary of our findings with reference to the Kinzua and Conewango projects. The evidence and the details which support these findings are given in a longer statement which I shall supply to the Committee. I have dealt with this situation from

the background of more than 50 years of almost uninterrupted experience with water control projects. Incidentally, several of my most striking successes have resulted from a persistent policy of overall exploration of situations in search of unexpected possibilities which conventional or routine engineering had overlooked. At this late date I would not risk my professional reputation on an irresponsible venture. I am thoroughly convinced that my conclusions are sound.

#### AN ENGINEERING OVERSIGHT

There was an engineering oversight more than 30 years ago when the Kinzua plan was, in fact, selected. Unless that oversight is corrected, Pittsburgh, Warren, and other cities will have less flood protection from the upper Allegheny than they need, and far less than is readily available by the use of Conewango. Unless corrected, that oversight will cost the country much more than \$100 million, and probably three or four times as much, in added cost or loss of values. This is not an irresponsible guess, but the result of applying the methods used by the Corps of Engineers in estimating benefits for requesting appropriations; or in one case, determination of costs or loss by the rules established by the American Association of Highway Officials.

In the years since the original oversight, much officework and some fieldwork has been done on the details of Kinzua, and massive reports on those details have been made by the corps, but no general exploration and study have been made either by the corps, or by engineers employed by the corps, to review the original decision of more than 30 years ago, as to what alternative possibilities existed. The best of those alternative possibilities remained undiscovered and unrecognized. This statement applies to the recent work of the Tippetts firm, which was employed by the corps, as well as the work of the corps itself.

I am not here to criticize or blame. The issue far transcends personalities. If we are correct, and we believe that we are, the country will gain greatly by adoption of the Conewango plan. Fortunately, as rarely occurs, the opportunity exists to correct an oversight of 30 years standing.

#### KINZUA IS INADEQUATE

The trouble with Kinzua is that it does not have enough storage capacity, and that it cannot be enlarged. The approximate location of the Kinzua Dam site is fixed by natural conditions, and cannot be changed. The city of Salamanca, located in the valley bottom, upstream from the dam, sets the limit of how far upstream the water can be stored. Kinzua has capacity for just so much storage, and no more. No amount of engineering calculations can change those hard facts.

Kinzua storage is not enough. All the Corps of Engineers can do with Kinzua is to whittle down their estimates of requirements until they are as small as the absolutely limited capacity of Kinzua, and then to call those quantities enough. This whittling down has been of serious proportions.

To begin with, the corps decided that Pittsburgh needs to be protected against only half of the maximum probable flood, as determined by the U.S. Weather Bureau, at the request of the corps. The great flood catastrophes of the short history of our country have mostly come from rare, unusual, so-called unprecedented storms. I believe that, in view of the concentration of people and property at Pittsburgh, and the extreme vulnerability of that city to floods, it would be good policy to provide a greater degree of protection. With Kinzua such increase is impossible.

In contrast, Conewango, at a cost of \$25 million less than the Army estimate for

Kinzua, and \$50 million less than the real cost of Kinzua, would fully and completely protect Pittsburgh and Warren from the most extreme flood, up to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  or 3 times what Kinzua would fully protect against, and would provide as much storage as is claimed for Kinzua for increasing low water-flow.

If the capacity of Conewango should be increased to the point where it would cost \$105 million, or \$8 million less than the Army Engineers estimate for Kinzua, and I recommend that course, Conewango would not only protect against the most extreme maximum flood, but in addition would have capacity to store three times as much water as is claimed for Kinzua for increasing the low waterflow. The findings summarized here are on the basis of that larger capacity. Such storage would enable Conewango to store for low-water increase the entire year's flow during low-water years, and in addition to hold over much of the flow of wet years for use in dry years.

Now, in order to consider some of the whittling down that must be done for Kinzua to make it appear large enough to give full protection from even half the maximum flood, let us assume for the moment that Pittsburgh needs to be protected from a flood only half as great as the probable maximum, as estimated by the Weather Bureau.

To begin with, the flood storage provided for Kinzua in the Army plans is not 50 percent of their own estimate of the maximum flood, but for only 43.2 percent. The deficiency is 117,000 acre-feet.

A further deficiency arises from the fact that, whereas the Army plans presume to store 745,000 acre-feet for flood storage, and 573,000 acre-feet for increasing low waterflow and for dead storage, yet the total storage capacity of the reservoir falls short of this amount by 138,000 acre-feet. The reasons why, in case of Kinzua, the same storage space cannot be used both for flood control and for low water storage are given in our longer statement.

Again, the Army plans for Kinzua have inadequate provisions for snow on the ground at the time of the flood storm. Here is a deficiency which may amount to 200,000 acre-feet or more.

The Army plans assume that two-thirds of the storm rainfall would run off, including snowmelt, if any. We have dependable record, for a similar area on flatter land—the Dayton flood of 1913—with similar rainfall conditions, with no snow on the ground, where the runoff was more than 90 percent of the rainfall. If we assume even 80 percent of runoff, instead of 66 percent, this deficit is 158,000 acre-feet.

These items, amounting to more than 600,000 acre-feet, indicate a very large deficiency below a factor of safety which would be desirable, even on the basis of protecting against only half the maximum flood. That deficiency is more than the entire storage assumed to be provided for low water control.

Against such possibilities and uncertainties, reasonably conservative engineering judgment will seek for a margin of safety, especially as some of these possibilities tend to be cumulative—that is, they tend to accentuate each other, and to occur at the same time. It is the good fortune of the Upper Allegheny situation that all this factor of safety, and much more, can be secured by the Conewango plan at less than the cost of Kinzua. And, because of the smaller and simpler structures required, the Conewango construction would require 2 years less time.

If we consider that protection against two-thirds of the maximum storm would be desirable, rather than against a storm half the maximum, the deficiency would be increased

by about 290,000 acre-feet, making a total deficiency for Kinzua of more than the whole flood control storage planned for Kinzua.

#### THE ECONOMIC AND HUMAN LOSS OF KINZUA

Additional storage capacity, to provide a reasonable margin of safety against even half the probable maximum flood at the Army estimate of the cost per acre-foot of storage in Kinzua, would be worth \$57 million.

The storage of three times as much water for increase of low waterflow, estimated by methods adopted by the U.S. Public Health Service and the Corps of Engineers, would have an additional value of \$9 million to \$30 million.

The Army plans for Kinzua require that after a flood the flood-control portions of the reservoir shall be emptied as soon as possible, at the rate of 25,000 cubic feet per second, so as to have storage space for the next flood. That water must go down the Allegheny past Warren, to Pittsburgh and into the Ohio River. To empty the Kinzua Reservoir at this rate after a standard design flood would take about 3 weeks. In at least three quarters of the cases this release would be during the flood season, just the time of year when the Ohio and Mississippi are most likely to be in flood.

Moreover, a decision would have to be made at the time of every moderate flood whether to recognize the possibility of a subsequent great storm and to keep storage space for it by letting the early part of the flood go down to Pittsburgh, with moderate damages of from \$3 million to \$30 million, or to hold the water behind the Kinzua Dam and save Pittsburgh the moderate damages, but to take the chance of having used up the storage, and so of having exhausted that much storage capacity when the catastrophic flood comes. Usually the guess that the flood will be moderate would be right. Only in case of great floods would it be wrong. In every one of the more than 25 cases where the Corps of Engineers has estimated the benefits which would have accrued to Pittsburgh if Kinzua had been built, they assumed that only a moderate flood would occur. The operation of the Kinzua Dam, as the Corps of Engineers announce they would operate it, would be on the assumption that there would be no storm greater than 43.2 percent of the probable maximum, and that none of the possibilities and exigencies I have mentioned would occur. Kinzua would protect Pittsburgh from moderate flood losses only at the risk of increasing damage from a very large flood. With Conewango, no such issue arises, since the storage capacity plus discharge capacity to Lake Erie is more than ample for all purposes.

As another element in the situation, the National Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to control floods throughout the Ohio and Mississippi River Valleys. This commonly is by storage reservoirs, which can hold the flood back for a limited time. The Conewango plan would take the part of this unwanted water which could not be stored in Conewango for increase of the low water supply, and would remove it entirely from the Ohio-Mississippi River system, discharging it into Lake Erie. Taking the value of removing such excess of floodwater as it is variously estimated by the Army Engineers, we have an estimated value of somewhere between \$60 million to \$200 million.

There is another serious disadvantage of Kinzua. The Kinzua Reservoir would destroy the only water level highway through the mountains in that region, one of the finest highway locations in Pennsylvania, and would replace it with a steep, crooked two-lane highway along the precipitous mountainside, with grades of 10 percent at sharp curves. This would then be one of the



poorest through highways in Pennsylvania—far below the minimum standards for American highways. Using the basis of estimate established by the American Society of Highway Officials, we estimate the loss and damage of this change, which is a proper element of cost of Kinzua, to be \$25 million. Conewango does not have any similar item.

The Allegheny Valley from Warren to Salamanca is one of the finest recreation, fishing, and hunting areas in Eastern America, as is indicated in the report of the Army Engineers. The valley bottom provides almost the only winter forage for the deer and wild turkey in the State parks adjoining it, and is essential to the maintenance of the good hunting. All this would be destroyed by Kinzua Dam, whereas Conewango would not only preserve this resource and give it a good nearly uniform flow of water the year round, but in addition, would create another recreation area far greater than the lake at Kinzua. The loss of public value due to the destruction of the Allegheny Valley recreation area would run into millions of dollars.

The Kinzua project would require the removal of the Pennsylvania Railroad from a long stretch of the Allegheny Valley. In view of its use as a heavy coal-carrying route and of actively pending industrial developments along the valley, especially in paper-making, this is a matter of consequence.

In the entire Ohio-Mississippi River system there is no other point where a given amount of storage for increasing low water flow would be so valuable. Conewango would double the minimum flow of the Ohio at Pittsburgh, and for some distance below, and would increase the minimum flow through the entire length of the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. Because of salt beds, cheap coal, and abundant labor, this area promises to be the chemical industry center for America, the chief limiting factor being the water supply. Conewango would conserve that to the utmost. Kinzua would waste the greater part of it.

#### ADVANTAGES OF CONEWANGO

The advantages of Conewango over Kinzua to which we have applied financial estimates, using the minimum figures in all cases, amount to more than \$100 million, and if less than the maximum figures are used, to about \$400 million.

It is almost embarrassing to mention such large figures in speaking of the advantages of Conewango over Kinzua, when a fraction of that difference should be conclusive. The fact is that in the Conewango setting and the natural enormous outlet channel to Lake Erie we have a most unusual situation. In probably not one reservoir building job in a thousand would one find such a combination of favorable conditions. But there it is, and these surprising values naturally follow from it. Why throw them away for the sake of not admitting an error of 30 years ago?

It may be argued that if Kinzua is built now, in a few years when the air is cleared, Conewango can then be built. But this would mean a great loss. The irreplaceable water-level highway along the Allegheny would have been destroyed. The exceptionally fine recreation area along the Allegheny would have been wiped out. And since both reservoirs are not needed, most of the cost of building Kinzua would have been wasted.

#### THE COST OF CONEWANGO

Now as to cost estimates for constructing Conewango. Our estimate is \$60 million less than that of the Tippetts firm for the same degree of protection they planned. About half that difference is due to the fact that the Tippetts firm overlooked the best of the possibilities, that is, the outlet to Lake Erie by Cattaraugus Creek. When they started their study I told them that I had only begun

to look into the many possibilities of Conewango and that further exploration might disclose great opportunities for economies. I urged them to make those further studies. They did not do that, but only looked into the specific suggestions I was able to make at the time they began. I continued my inquiry, and turned up other possibilities so much superior as to make my earlier suggestions obsolete. When I asked the Tippetts engineers to look into other possibilities I had found, they replied that they did not have time to do so. They never made a general study of the situation, and never qualified themselves to pass on all the major alternatives.

Diversion down the Cattaraugus, which the Tippetts engineers did not study, reduces the cost by \$20 million under the plan for diversion down Silver Creek, which they did study. A proper treatment of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which they overlooked, further reduces the cost by about \$9 million. These two corrections alone would reduce the Tippetts estimate of cost for Conewango to where it is no higher than Kinzua. But there are other large errors in the Tippetts estimate, to the extent of another \$30 million.

Construction conditions for Conewango are strikingly different from those for Kinzua. For instance, excavation for Kinzua highways is on precipitous mountainsides, and a large part of it is in solid rock. In contrast to this, the principal earthmoving for Conewango highways is on level bottom land, where there is no rock, but only sand, gravel, and clay. There are millions of yards of this exceptionally favorable work, which would actually cost only about a third as much per cubic yard as would the earth and solid rock on the precipitous mountainside in Kinzua. The Army Engineers estimated \$1 a cubic yard for this difficult mountain-side earth and rock excavation. The Tippetts engineers took that price per yard and applied it throughout for highway and railroad earthmoving for Conewango, where the real cost would be about a third as much per cubic yard.

The Tippetts engineers took the same course concerning timber clearing. For the Kinzua job, the timber clearing is mostly on steep, rocky mountainsides, or along riverbanks where the trees lean toward the water, and fall into it when they are cut, making it necessary to haul each one out by cable. There are more than a hundred miles of such riverbanks on the Kinzua project. For the Kinzua job this clearing was estimated at \$500 an acre. On the Conewango project the timber clearing is in large tracts of flatland, where modern clearing equipment is at its best, and where the actual cost per acre of clearing would be about a third as much for Kinzua. Yet here the Tippetts firm used the same price, \$500 per acre, for the broad flatlands in Conewango as was used for the steep mountainsides and miles of riverbank clearing on Kinzua.

This same careless process of transferring unit costs on one job to very different conditions on another job was used in relation to earth dam construction. That is not responsible engineering.

Also, the Tippetts engineers, in estimating highway changes for Conewango, ignored the published and accepted standards of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and the New York Department of Public Works, which provide that such an improvement is responsible only for meeting the extra expense made necessary by the improvement. The Tippetts engineers planned farflung highway changes, with standards of construction far more expensive than anything now existing or (with the single exception of U.S. Route 17) beyond anything even remotely planned in that area, and charged the whole cost to the Conewango project, thus improperly adding millions of dollars to their estimate.

In order that there should be the least possible reason for differences of opinion about cost estimates, we used the Tippetts estimates unchanged except where we had clear reason and data for changing them. For a large part of the Tippetts estimates they give almost no data from which their estimates can be checked. We took their estimates without change in such cases, not because we think they are right, but because they gave almost no information for checking them. We believe they are too high by a further \$5 to \$10 million more of improper cost.

With the corrections in unit costs which I have mentioned, and with the change of outlet and treatment of the Pennsylvania Railroad, our estimate for Conewango to fully protect Pittsburgh and Warren from three times as large a flood as would Kinzua, and to store the same amount of water for low water increase, is somewhat less than \$85 million. If the project should be enlarged to cost \$105 million, which still is \$8 million less than the Army engineers estimate for Kinzua, then in addition to all these values it would also store three times as much water as Kinzua for increasing the low water flow.

#### THE BASIS OF THE DECISION OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AGAINST CONEWANGO

The Tippetts engineers, in their letter presenting their report to the Corps of Engineers, made just three points against the Conewango plan. They were:

- First, that the plan would cost more;
- Second, that more people would be displaced; and
- Third, that more land would be taken.

The charge that Conewango would cost more is inaccurate.

As to persons displaced, the six villages in the Kinzua Reservoir would be completely buried under water, and according to the explicit statement of the Army Engineers, 90 percent of the population in the Kinzua Reservoir would have to be removed to entirely new locations at a considerable distance.

In the Conewango area, on the contrary, at least 75 percent of the persons affected live in six villages around the margins of the marsh. The parts of these villages which might be flooded would be moved up hill a fraction of a mile without interrupting the community life. These are extremely quiet places in an economically depressed area. In one of these village only one new house—a 4-room cottage—has been built in the past hundred years. These old villages would be changed to live communities in one of the best recreation areas in the region.

The Tippetts report improperly included the entire population of these villages among the persons displaced by the Conewango improvement. If these villages are omitted from the count, the displacement is far greater for Kinzua than for Conewango. Therefore, that criticism is misleading and inappropriate. Moreover, the Tippetts report failed to count approximately 400 of the 835 Indians who would be displaced by the Kinzua project.

As to land taken, it is not acres which count, but values. The Conewango Marsh has little value. Omitting the villages mentioned, the market value of the land, as estimated by the Corps of Engineers and by the Tippetts engineers, and including the State park land, is greater for Kinzua than for Conewango. That criticism of Conewango has no validity.

These three reasons are the only ones given by the Corps of Engineers to the public and to the Congress in announcing the decision rejecting the Conewango plan.

An engineering oversight of more than 30 years ago never has been competently reviewed during the years since, either by the

Corps of Engineers or by engineers employed by them. If not corrected, it will cause the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in cost and values. If I should be able to contribute in some degree to preventing that loss, and to avoid the breaking of the oldest living treaty of our country, I should feel that I had at least justified my food and lodging for my lifetime.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR E. MORGAN.

#### APPENDIX

##### HOW THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS CHECKED ESTIMATES FOR THE DIVERSION PROJECT TO LAKE ERIE

When I testified before the Senate subcommittee in April 1957, my testimony and that of Barton M. Jones was given by Senator ELLENDER of the Senate subcommittee to the Corps of Engineers with a request that our estimates be appraised. Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the subcommittee, said:

"At this point I wish to state that I am going to ask Mr. Tofani to bring the suggestion of Mr. Morgan to the attention of the Army Engineers, and when I recall them in the next 2 weeks that they are prepared and give us an estimate of the costs and advisability of such a method to control the waters of the Allegheny.

"I wish to give you assurance that before this committee acts we shall go into the details of your views. \* \* \* And I hope that the engineers give you the same treatment that you give to them. \* \* \* I have been dealing with them, the Army Engineers, 20 years now. I haven't found them wanting." (Public Works Appropriation, 1958, pp. 2464, 2471, and 2473.)

Without doubt the action of Congress has been in part based on the assurances given them by the Corps of Engineers.

The reply of the corps to the Senate committee was characterized by a lack of understanding and an inaccuracy which we can scarcely imagine coming from a great public agency. The Conewango setting makes possible several different types of design. One of these, as described by Barton Jones in his testimony, calls for a very large channel, with 160 million yards of excavation, to carry all flood water quickly to Lake Erie below ground level, with almost no reservoir storage, and therefore requiring the taking of relatively little land—in this case 8,000 acres. It would, in fact, drain and reclaim several thousand acres of the Conewango marsh. Another type of design called for large storage capacity in that same marsh, requiring the taking of 32,000 acres of land, but calling for the excavation of 60 million cubic yards of earth—100 million cubic yards less.

In estimating the cost for the Senate committee, the corps took the big estimate of 160 million cubic yards of excavation from one type of plan, and the big estimate of 32,000 acres of land from another very different design, and included the cost of both as though they were part of one design. It would be physically impossible for these two major elements to be parts of the same plan.

The land to be taken by the large channel would be mostly in the lowest part of the Conewango marsh. The actual sales prices for the lowland which would be occupied by this channel, were recorded by the Tippetts engineers, runs from \$6 to \$30 per acre. The estimate presented by General Person is \$567 an acre. Thus, General Person's estimate of the cost of land required is more than 75 times what it should be.

It is clear that whoever made this estimate was ignorant of the fundamental conditions of the plans for which he was making an estimate, and similarly uninformed as to the nature of the land taken and as to its going value. Of course, this resulted in a totally false and inaccurate estimate of cost.

This impossible combination of elements from strikingly different plants was accompanied by an excessive estimate of unit cost and the mistaken classification of material. The Corps of Engineers estimated that the work proposed in Mr. Jones' testimony would cost \$200 million as against Mr. Jones' estimate of \$80 million. The largest single item in the estimate of the corps, as estimated by General Person, was for construction of a section of large channel calling for the excavation of 77 million cubic yards of glacial sand, clay, and gravel.

Now the Tippetts engineers, who made their study a few months later, in the employ of the Corps, had a large item for substantially identical material, to be excavated under less favorable circumstances.<sup>1</sup> In that largest item in the project, their estimated cost, for identical material under less favorable conditions, was considerably less than half as much per cubic yard as in the estimate presented by General Person for the Corps of Engineers.

The work involved in this very large item is standard, large scale excavation, with no complications, and the cost can be estimated within quite narrow limits. On such work a difference of 25 percent either way from the mean would represent a very wide range for competent bidders who are financially and otherwise equipped to do the work to advantage. The variation of more than 100 percent in the estimates for such work is beyond all reason. It does not represent responsible estimating.

For another large item of 25 million cubic yards of identical material, that in the diversion channel, the estimated cost per cubic yard given to Senator ELLENDER by General Person for the corps is more than twice as high per cubic yard as that estimated by the Tippetts engineers for that identical material a few months later.

In addition the estimate which General Person presented to the Senate committee improperly classified more than 20 million cubic yards of excavation, and estimated it at more than five times the cost per cubic yard estimated by the Tippetts firm for substantially identical material. On these three earth moving items alone the estimate of the Corps of Engineers, as given to the Senate committee, is about \$50 million higher than it would be at the Tippetts estimate of unit cost for the same material.

The very careful and detailed analysis we had made of this cost indicated that the Tippetts estimates are somewhat high. Our estimates were made by a man whose work for 25 years has been to make detailed working estimates by which large contractors make their bids on large earth moving contracts. The estimates he made for this work were in the same careful detail with which he makes estimates for contractors' bids.

The estimate made by General Person for the Senate committee might be excused on the ground that in the short space of 2 weeks no adequate estimate could be made, and that mistakes were probable. Yet when General Person presented this estimate to the Senate committee, he testified:

"We feel the studies have been completed, and that further studies would not affect our conclusion."

<sup>1</sup> The chief differences were that the length and size of the channel in the Person item was larger, and that therefore the cost of equipment per cubic yard would be less in the item estimated by the Corps of Engineers than in the item estimated by Tippetts; and that the larger dimensions of the Person item would be more favorable to the method of excavation proposed (by Tippetts), the use of suction dredge. The actual unit cost for the Person item would be about 15 percent or 20 percent less than for the Tippetts item.

That has been the position of the corps all along.

Is it not a serious matter that when a Senate committee specifically calls for the judgment of a great national agency as to the adequacy of an estimate it is considering, that this agency should present a statement prepared without even a rudimentary understanding of the work under consideration, and that its estimates of cost should be more than double those made by responsible engineers? Under such circumstances, what chance is there for a fair hearing to be had? This, I regret to say, is somewhat typical of the publicity which has issued from the Pittsburgh office of the corps.

#### LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a letter to the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, a letter asking a series of questions on the U-2 incident and the summit meeting has been sent to the President of the United States by a large group of Members of the House.

The letter was sent to the White House Friday afternoon. Since then additional Members of the House have expressed a desire to sign their names to the letter.

A report listing additional signatures will be made to the House.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of our letter to the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1960.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am authorized by the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives to send you this letter.

We are distressed over the collapse of the summit meeting and the damage to our prestige and leadership in the world. The cause of world peace has been endangered. We believe that Congress and the people must ask the following questions. We believe it is the administration's responsibility to answer these questions:

1. Why was the U-2 flight over the Soviet Union ordered just prior to the summit meeting?
2. When the U-2 incident became public, why were a series of contradictory and false statements issued by administration officials—and who was responsible?
3. Why did the administration order a worldwide military alert from Paris on the eve of the summit?
4. Why did the administration first indicate that as a matter of national policy it would continue manned flights over Russia, and then reverse itself and say that it had ordered them discontinued?
5. Was it necessary to compromise the announced peaceful role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) by using it as a cover for an espionage operation?
6. Why was there no coordination between the agency responsible for the U-2 flight and the agency responsible for our diplomatic functions?
7. Why did the President announce in advance that as our Chief of State he might return to Washington before the conference ended?



8. Has the traditional American policy of civilian supremacy over the military been impaired?

Cordially,

FRANK KOWALSKI, Member of Congress, Connecticut; CHET HOLIFIELD, 19th District, California; LEE METCALF, 1st District, Montana; STEWART L. UDALL, 2d District, Arizona; ROY W. WIER, 3d District, Minnesota; GERALD T. FLYNN, 1st District, Wisconsin; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; JEFFERY COHELAN, 7th District, California; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, 1st District, Michigan; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, 28th District, Pennsylvania; HENRY S. REUSS, 5th District, Wisconsin; ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, 2d District, Wisconsin; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., 4th District, New Jersey; JOSEPH E. KARTH, 4th District, Minnesota; DON MAGNUSON, 7th District, Washington; LEONARD G. WOLF, 2d District, Iowa; B. F. SISK, 12th District, California; MERWIN COAD, 6th District, Iowa; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, 14th District, New Jersey; JOHN A. BLATNIK, 8th District, Minnesota; CLEMENT W. MILLER, 1st District, California; BYRON L. JOHNSON, 2d District, Colorado; J. EDWARD ROUSH, 5th District, Indiana; HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., At Large, Delaware; JOHN F. SHELLEY, 5th District, California; EDITH GREEN, 3d District, Oregon; AL ULLMAN, 2d District, Oregon; CHARLES O. PORTER, 4th District, Oregon; JOHN BRADEMANS, 3d District, Indiana; LEROY H. ANDERSON, 2d District, Montana; JOHN D. DINGELL, 15th District, Michigan; JAMES C. OLIVER, 1st District, Maine; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, 11th District, New Jersey; PETER W. RODINO, JR., 10th District, New Jersey; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, 7th District, Maryland; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, 9th District, Ohio; CHESTER BOWLES, 2d District, Connecticut; ELMER J. HOLLAND, 30th District, Pennsylvania.

Additional signers to letter to President on U-2 and summit:

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, 41st District, New York.

GEORGE P. MILLER, Eighth District, California.

KENNETH J. GRAY, 25th District, Illinois.

CECIL R. KING, 17th District, California.

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., 13th District, Michigan.

JOHN R. FOLEY, Sixth District, Maryland.

WINFIELD K. DENTON, Eighth District, Indiana.

VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Eighth District, New York.

EDNA F. KELLY, 10th District, New York.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Eighth District, Illinois.

GEORGE A. KASEM, 25th District, California.

JAMES M. QUIGLEY, 19th District, Pennsylvania.

More names to be added to the list of signers for the letter to the President on the U-2 flight and summit:

LEONARD FARBSTEIN, 19th District, New York.

HERMAN TOLL, Sixth District, Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM H. MEYER, at large, Vermont.

EMANUEL CELLER, 11th District, New York.

JOHN H. DENT, 21st District, Pennsylvania.

EARL HOGAN, Ninth District, Indiana.

### EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, years ago this country recognized its responsibility to its children, and the first child labor laws were enacted. By the enactment of these laws, the Congress of the United States said that it believed there should be a minimum age established when a child could work.

The bill I introduce today will recognize another responsibility which I feel has become the responsibility of this Congress. That is to insure that men and women who desire to work, who are physically able, and who have proper technical skills and employment experience for the positions for which they apply, are permitted to work without regard to age.

Recent congressional hearings and studies reveal the fact that discrimination because of age can begin to haunt an individual as early as age 45 or even before. As our economy experiences more and more automation we find that workers in the 45 to 65 age group find it increasingly difficult to secure new employment.

To be unemployed because of age is a deep humiliation to a worker in the age group just mentioned, and jeopardizes the livelihood of themselves and their families. At the same time our Nation is deprived of one of our most valuable resources, the skill and experience of the mature person.

The American Legion and the Fraternal Order of Eagles, in both of which I am a member, have been concerned about this problem for some time, and I want to commend them for the educational campaign which they have carried forward to acquaint employers with the advantages of hiring workers in the 45 to 65 age bracket.

My bill would make discrimination because of age an unfair labor practice. It would amend the National Labor Relations Act by making it unlawful for an employer or a labor organization "to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, otherwise lawful, because of such individual's age, when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction."

Mr. Speaker, the reasons usually given for refusing to hire older workers is that they have "slowed down" or are "irregular in reporting on the job."

This assertion, Mr. Speaker, is not borne out by the facts which are included in the reports from the McNamara Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging in the United States, and a study conducted by the Department of Labor in 1956. These studies showed that older job seekers are more highly skilled

and more stable in terms of job changes and job tenure than younger workers. Also, these studies showed that there were no significant differences in absenteeism and safety records between young and older workers.

The hearings of the McNamara subcommittee make it clear that little progress has been made through voluntary or State action, and that it must now become a national legislative issue to overcome discriminatory employment practices.

My bill will make it plain that national policy is strongly opposed to such a waste of human resources and manpower, and that we are determined to do something about it.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] be permitted to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$243; and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] notwithstanding an estimated cost of \$384.75, may have the same permission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us what is the total cost where these extensions exceed the authorized cost?

Mr. McCORMACK. On the two cases I have just referred to?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. Mr. McCORMACK. One was in the sum of \$384.75 and the other \$243.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Both Democratic requests?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is an unnecessary observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Undoubtedly it is unnecessary, but—

Mr. McCORMACK. If we go into that, it will apply both ways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 12176.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

### CASCADE, IOWA, MEDICAL CENTER EXAMPLE OF RURAL AMERICA IN SUCCESSFUL SELF-HELP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, America's increasing population and higher living standards have created the need for more and better hospital and medical facilities. The Federal Government has

already recognized this need, and its responsibility in this field by helping communities, through their State agencies, to construct those hospital and medical facilities which are necessary to meet their needs. It has done this through the well-known Hill-Burton hospital program.

This program has been a great help. The needs of all communities, however, cannot be accommodated as only those areas which State agencies determine have the greatest needs or priorities have been able to construct hospital and medical facilities with Hill-Burton matching funds.

There is located in my district in northeastern Iowa a community which provides an excellent example of the action which a community can follow when it finds that it must construct modern medical facilities, without Federal aid, in order to attract and keep a local doctor. The community to which I refer is Cascade, Iowa. It has a population of 1,500.

I would like to point out the tremendously vital service which the local newspaper performed in informing the citizens of the area of possible courses of action and in creating enthusiasm for the project. The efforts of the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser contributed a great deal to the successful culmination of the community's efforts. The work of this newspaper, in stimulating local interest and cooperation, can serve as an example to other newspapers in communities with similar problems.

On June 4, 1959, the local newspaper, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser, carried an editorial pointing out the need for resident doctors and a hospital. The editorial stated:

**CASCADE NEEDS RESIDENT DOCTORS; HOSPITAL HERE DEEMED NECESSARY**

What is one of the major problems facing small town Americans? That might be cataloged under one heading, adequate medical service. Hundreds of small towns, all over the United States, have that vexing problem, among them Cascade. What is the true picture regarding medical doctors locating in small towns? If you, as a citizen, interested in your community, in its growth and well being were to ask that question of one or all three of the committee appointed within recent months by the Commercial Club to look into the local doctor situation, you would be greatly concerned and shocked.

The day of the old family physician is passé. Gone is the day when the old family doctor, answered your summons, day or night, in fair weather or foul. Probably one of the last of that kind, Dr. M. I. Nederhiser, is just now returning to office practice, following an illness of several months, brought on by overwork. In their place has come the specialist.

Today's doctors demand and get something more than just an office in which to practice. Yes, the doctor of today wants and must have hospital facilities. If those facilities are not available the doctor goes elsewhere.

It doesn't take a seer or someone versed in business projection to reach that conclusion. All it requires is a visit with one or all three local men acting as a doctor committee, or by your own personal contacts, both inside and out of the medical profession.

As one young doctor who recently visited Cascade put it, "Our class has it made. We can practically dictate our own ticket. This is a business proposition with us just as

it is with anyone else about to engage in business. There must be adequate facilities available. What do you have to offer?"

Cascade as it is presently constituted is similar to other small towns needing additional medical service. It has plenty of work, too much for one doctor to handle. True hospital facilities are as near as 8 miles in one direction and 25 in another direction but evidently that does not suffice. They must be here.

One of Iowa's small towns which can boast to top medical service is Buffalo Center, population 1,200. It has three medical doctors, all under 40 years of age. How did they secure three such doctors? First and foremost the town has hospital facilities. Originally started by a Dr. Dromlage, the hospital with a recent new addition is 100 by 40 feet of brick design, modern in every way. It has 14 rooms containing 20 beds. Twenty-three people are on its payroll including nurses, nurses' aids, cooks, and so forth.

A basic requirement for any community, if it is long to remain in the sun, is to be constantly alert toward improving itself. One of those basic requirements is adequate medical service. What then must we do as citizens of this community to insure the health of not only ourselves but our neighbors, as well. We must meet those challenges which face the small town and make every attempt to solve them. First, by being a booster for community betterment and second, whenever and wherever possible to assist in a monetary manner.

On June 18, 1959, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser explained to its readers the Buffalo Center, Iowa, Hospital and Clinic project as follows:

**BUFFALO CENTER HOSPITAL AND CLINIC**

The town of Buffalo Center, population 1,200, has the above fine hospital available for use by the residents of the area. The hospital has 20 rooms and last year admitted 936 patients. Services available include: obstetrical, surgical, X-ray, complete lab, physical therapy, and general medical. Three young doctors are on the staff of the Buffalo Center Hospital, which was founded by a fourth doctor, Dr. George Francis Dromlage. Considerable effort is now being expended by interested persons trying to build a hospital in Cascade.

**WHAT'S YOUR IDEA?**

An editorial in this column 2 weeks ago on the possibilities of building a hospital here and through such a hospital alleviate our medical doctor shortage, drew much favorable comment. Everyone agreed a hospital or clinic should be built. Not only was the local comment favorable, but it was well received in other localities. The editorial pointed up the fact that Buffalo Center, a town of 1,200 people, which is about 300 smaller than Cascade, has its own hospital the 3 young medical doctors. That hospital is self-sustaining. The editorial was read over quite a wide area, as the writer has been told of a number of other towns who now have hospitals or realize they must provide better health facilities for residents of their communities. Three towns who are presently building hospitals or will get them underway shortly are Guttenberg, Cresco, and Decorah. Each of those three towns now have hospitals but within recent months those hospitals failed to meet State requirements. In each instance it was a case of either building a new hospital, completely revamping their present one, or just quitting. As can be imagined not one chose the last. On the contrary each decided to provide their people with the best facilities possible. Under such community momentum, new hospitals will be built, assisted by the Hill-Burton Federal plan which provides that the Federal Government furnish 33 1/3 percent of the cost. Location of each of the towns mentioned bears out the

fact they are within easy driving distance of other towns having hospital facilities. Buffalo Center is close to Clear Lake, Mason City, Lake Mills, and Forest City. Decorah is only 1 hour removed from the Mayo Clinic at Rochester. Guttenberg is the same distance or approximately so as is Cascade from Dubuque. Will we as a community unite and give the hospital or clinic our fullest consideration or shall we just forget the whole proposition?

On July 2, 1959, the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser in citing the Guttenberg, Iowa, Hospital as an example, stated:

**ANOTHER TOWN LOOKS FORWARD**

Guttenberg, Iowa, a town of 1,900, 38 miles north of Cascade, with only 400 larger population, has broken ground for a beautiful new 30-bed hospital. It can in reality accommodate 40 beds. When complete it will be ultramodern and compare favorably with any Dubuque hospital, only on a smaller scale.

The present hospital at Guttenberg was condemned in recent months by the State board of health. It therefore became necessary to do one of three things, remodel the present structure, build a new one, or fold up, so to speak, insofar as home hospital facilities were concerned. Having had the many benefits, over a long number of years, that a hospital can and does bring, there was only one thought uppermost in the minds of the majority of the people of that community, and that was of course to build.

Originally it was planned to start on a small scale, around \$50,000 to \$100,000, a unit for the handling of minor surgery, confinements, etc. When the fund drive actually got under way there was so much enthusiasm generated it immediately became apparent they could do much better.

Application for a Federal grant brought the information that the area actually needed a 30-bed hospital, and on that premise, money would be available. To fulfill that requirement it was necessary for the community to project its thinking: \$300,000 was raised by contributions, a \$100,000 bond issue passed with the Government furnishing the \$200,000.

Cascade does not need a \$600,000 hospital or one of anywhere near that amount. The above does show, however, what another Iowa town, in our population bracket is doing to cement its community. What Cascade probably does need is what Guttenberg originally started out to get, a \$50,000 to \$100,000 hospital where minor surgery, confinements, etc., may be taken care of. We either move forward or slip backward. There is no middle ground insofar as community life is concerned. In your measured judgment which of the two has Cascade done in the past 3 years?

On July 16, 1959, the new medical clinic in Elizabeth, Ill., was cited by the Pioneer-Advertiser:

**ANOTHER SMALL TOWN LOOKS FORWARD**

Elizabeth, Ill., on U.S. Highway 20, is about 25 miles east of Dubuque and has a population of 800. It has recently completed a medical clinic at a cost of \$28,000. Information provided by Mr. John H. Gerkman, owner of an appliance center bearing his name, furnishes the Pioneer-Advertiser with the following data relative to that clinic:

The building is 44 by 36 and was built in accordance with the Sears-Roebuck Foundation plan. The Sears Foundation furnished the building plans free. Mr. Gerkman said it was not necessary for the Sears Foundation to help them further but that help was available. "The building is very modern," Mr. Gerkman wrote. "It is brick veneer, has two examination rooms, two treatment rooms, consultation room, nurse and reception room, large waiting room, emergency room, X-ray room, utility room, two washrooms. The building is air conditioned, gas heated."



Mr. Gerkman also writes they had been trying to secure a doctor for more than a year but none were approachable because of the lack of modern facilities.

An organization, known as the Elizabeth Development Association, numbering 14, was set up. Each member subscribed for \$2,000 in shares, total \$28,000. A board of directors and building committee were elected. This board took office in December of last year. Today, Mr. Gerkman writes, "We have a young doctor who likes the setup very much."

Mr. Gerkman invites people from this area who might be interested in the clinic to drive to Elizabeth and see it close up.

Having shown the residents of the area what other towns of comparable size had accomplished in providing adequate medical and hospital facilities for their people, the Pioneer-Advertiser on August 13, 1959, announced a community-wide hospital survey in Cascade under the direction of the Sears Foundation of Chicago, Ill., to ascertain the community needs in the way of increased hospital and medical services. The text of this announcement follows:

#### SURVEY TO DETERMINE MEDICAL STATUS

Going forward this week is an impartial random, communitywide sample survey to ascertain what this community needs in the way of increased medical services.

This survey is being made under the supervision and direction of Sears Foundation, Chicago, Ill. Assisting in the work are two separate groups, Cascade Woman's Club and members of a committee from American Legion and business circles which has been meeting regularly Monday evenings to try and seek an answer to more adequate medical service for this area.

#### NEED NEW INSTRUMENTS

Cascade is not the only small community which finds itself in the position of having curtailed medical service. Other small communities are likewise handicapped when competing with larger towns and cities for the services of doctors. The reason: doctors today need laboratories, X-rays, modern instruments—all the facilities of modern medicine to verify their diagnosis and speed patients' recovery.

#### MUST HAVE FACILITIES

Doctors now locate in cities where they have the facilities they need, at the local hospital. But if they settle in small communities they usually must either buy the equipment or do without.

Consequently, as doctors die or move away, few younger doctors take up their practice. The people in such communities are then forced to go to larger towns or cities for their medical care. And even when some doctors remain, who have inadequate facilities, the people rely on them mainly for emergencies and first aid. Their more serious ailments are treated by larger towns and city doctors.

#### NEED MODERNIZATION

To combat that, small communities like Cascade must provide themselves with modern medical facilities. Only then will competent young doctors be induced to settle in small communities, like ours. And only then will people of this area receive the quality of medical care they need.

#### WILL SHOW NEED?

The community survey which is now being conducted will show whether a definite need exists for a doctor or doctors in this community. This preliminary survey provides a factual evaluation of the medical needs of this area—and if such do exist the community has something of definite value with which to interest the doctor or doctors.

#### PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT

Sears Foundation has retained a professional architect who specializes in medical architecture. Plans are available through them for a one- and two-doctor unit that is adaptable to local conditions, modern in design, and contains many built-in features. Complete plans and specifications are given to cooperating communities.

The community that provides modern medical facilities increases also its competitive position with larger communities in obtaining a physician. Sears, Roebuck Foundation has a close working relationship with the American Medical Association and the State medical societies. The foundation will also assist the doctor or doctors in setting up forms, accounting procedures and policies. It will also assist as an expert in medical business practice.

Sears, Roebuck Foundation is a nonprofit corporation and endowed by Sears, Roebuck & Co. to aid in the economic and social improvement of the American community.

In summing up what the committee has been doing and is still doing, with the help of the local woman's club, if the survey returns are favorable and a definite need is established for more adequate medical services, we must become more self-reliant and adopt also a do-it-ourselves plan, fashioned somewhat after the lines of those appearing in the Sunday daily newspapers. We either move forward or backward. There is no standing still.

A report on the medical economic survey was published in the Pioneer-Advertiser on September 10, 1959, as follows:

#### MEDICAL ECONOMIC SURVEY OF CASCADE, IOWA, BY THE SEARS, ROEBUCK FOUNDATION

It is the purpose of this survey to evaluate the community and its trade area as to its medical habits, economic potential, and ability to support a doctor. The foundation has been conducting such surveys for over 2 years and in those communities surveyed that have secured doctors, the doctors' actual experience shows, in every case, the economic potential as stated in the survey, to be conservative.

#### POPULATION COMPOSITION

Cascade, Iowa, is a town of 1,423 population, located 25 miles west of Dubuque. The population is mainly German and Irish, consisting of 42.7 percent adult, 57.3 percent children. Main industry is beef raising and farming.

#### HOSPITALIZATION

During the last 12 months, it is estimated 16.5 percent of the population was hospitalized. They went to:

Town:	Distance (miles)	Percent
Monticello, Iowa	10	48.3
Dubuque, Iowa	25	38.0
Iowa City, Iowa	60	12.6
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	45	1.1

The causes were:

	Percent
Medical	52.8
Surgical	26.4
Obstetrics	20.8

#### SICKNESS IN THE AREA

During the last 12 months there was an estimated 4,477, separate illnesses necessitating 8,155 individual visits to the doctor. This averages 27 patients a day visiting doctors. The breakdown shows these patients are visiting doctors in the following communities:

Town:	Distance (miles)	Percent
Monticello	10	61.5
Dubuque	25	20.8
Cascade	—	11.2
Dyersville	16	4.5
Other towns	—	2.0

#### DISTANCE TRAVELED

In order to visit doctors, the people of the Cascade area, in the last 12 months, traveled 228,580 miles. This averages 790 miles per day, round trip or roughly the distance from Cascade to Birmingham, Ala.

#### Economic potential

Estimated expenditure for medical care based on office calls and inoculations only	\$22,675
Estimated expenditure for medicines (bought in towns other than Cascade)	17,000
Estimated annual expenditure for gas and oil driving to and from doctors offices	4,070
Total	43,745

In addition, these persons, when visiting doctors in neighboring towns purchasing household supplies (other than medicines) estimated to total \$72,530.

#### INSURANCE

Fifty-four percent carry hospital insurance.

Forty-three and three-tenths percent carry health insurance.

#### AN INVITATION

You and your family are urged to attend a meeting of utmost importance to the future of this entire community, a medical center, bringing with it increased medical coverage. This meeting will be held at 8 p.m., Monday, September 14 at Legion Pavilion, Cascade.

Speaker will be Mr. Norman H. Davis, from Sears Foundation, Chicago, Ill., who will tell us how we, as a community, may secure increased medical coverage.

Slides of other medical centers will be shown.

#### COMMITTEE ON EXPANSION FOR MEDICAL SERVICE.

A communitywide meeting was held on September 14, and the results of that meeting were reported by this local paper on September 17 as follows:

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Sept. 17, 1959]

#### OVERWHELMING MARGIN FAVORS CENTER PROJECT

By an overwhelming margin of 231 to 6, those persons attending Monday evening's public meeting voted to work with the Sears Roebuck Foundation to secure increased medical facilities for Cascade and community. The written vote was taken following a 2-hour meeting in Legion Pavilion.

Norman H. Davis, director of the foundation's medical program, gave a talk on the community medical assistance plan and showed slides of one- and two-doctor units the foundation has helped communities build.

The next step will be organizational. A nonprofit corporation will be formed and an executive committee appointed. This committee will then form solicitation teams for the fund raising which will be in the form of pledges of loans to the corporation. The pledges will be called in at a later date. Retirement of these loans (they are not donations) is determined by the executive committee and will be done as the corporation is financially able to do so. Income for the loans comes from rent of the doctors. The stockholders may decide at a later date if they wish to sell the building to the doctors, should they want to buy it.

Davis pointed out that no less than a 2-doctor unit should be considered for Cascade. The cost of such a medical center can be guaranteed by the foundation not to exceed \$35,000. That cost would be for a building 48 x 44 and would include everything but the doctors' equipment, which

they will purchase themselves. Davis pointed out that the Sears-Roebuck Foundation has nothing to sell, but is only interested in giving its services to those communities needing them.

#### SECURE DOCTORS

Another service that will be performed by the foundation will be to use its contacts with the placement service of the American Medical Association, the State medical society and the efforts of its own medical advisory board in interesting physicians to come to Cascade. Davis pointed out that when a community accepts the program offered by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation and raises money to build the medical center, then the foundation feels obligated to work toward securing doctors until they are successful. He said the foundation takes the responsibility of getting doctors because of working with the community on the problem.

The following eight excerpts from the Cascade Pioneer-Advertiser depict the fund-raising drive, the election of temporary officers, the selection of a hospital site, the start and progress of construction:

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 1, 1959]

#### MEDICAL CENTER FUNDRAISING DRIVE TO BEGIN NEXT WEEK

The fundraising drive to build the medical center for Cascade and area will start early next week. Campaign materials have been received from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation and precampaign planning is now being taken care of.

A recent survey made in Cascade by the foundation shows that an average of 23 patients a day travel to surrounding communities for medical care. This results in a cash loss of medical fees of \$22,675 and \$17,000 for medicines. It requires \$4,070 for gas and oil to visit these communities. In addition, these persons, when visiting doctors in neighboring towns purchase household supplies (other than medicines) estimated to total \$72,530. This brings the total economic loss to Cascade to \$116,275.

The Community Medical Assistance Plan of the Sears, Roebuck Foundation offers Cascade an opportunity to stop this economic loss as well as make our area a trade center for this rural area.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 8, 1960]

#### ONE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR LOAN TO MEDICAL CENTER

The American Legion Auxiliary of Cascade at its Monday meeting voted to loan \$1,000 to the fund for the construction of the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. Mrs. R. P. Nellers, auxiliary president, presented the check Tuesday morning to R. L. Tucker and Adrian Kurt, committee members. The fund drive was officially opened Tuesday evening when over 40 captains met to receive their instructions and pledge cards. Every person in the area will be contacted to help reach the goal of \$50,000.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 15, 1959]

#### PROGRESS NOTED—MEDICAL CENTER CAMPAIGN TARGET DATE IS SATURDAY

Target date for completion of the fund-raising drive for the Cascade Medical Center, Inc., has been set for Saturday, October 17. This was the date set at the meeting of the captains on October 6.

The captains should turn in their checks and completed pledges at the Cascade State Bank before 4 p.m. Saturday. A special account has been opened at the bank to handle the fund.

Workers have been busy all week making their calls to help reach the goal of \$50,000. To insure the drive's success, it will be necessary for everyone to lend as much as possible. Anyone not contacted by Saturday who desires to make a loan to the center may do so at the bank or by calling one of the captains listed in last week's paper.

Additional captains named since last week's paper include Robert Curoe, Ray and Duane Recker, Walter Callahan, and Ralph McCarthy.

All captains are asked to meet Saturday night in the auxiliary room of the Memorial Building at 8 p.m.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 2, 1959]

#### GETTING CLOSE—MEDICAL CENTER FUND PLEDGED \$44,000

The fundraising drive to build the Cascade Medical Center, Inc., is nearing completion thanks to the generous support accorded it by approximately 480 individuals, clubs, and organizations. As of this date the fund has reached the total of \$44,937.

A few area captains have yet to make their reports so it now appears that the goal of \$50,000 will be reached. No doubt some persons wishing to make loans to the Center were missed in the solicitation. The committee would appreciate those persons stopping at the Cascade State Bank or contacting one of the committee members who will fill out a pledge card for them. Those persons can help immensely in reaching the final goal.

#### MEETING SATURDAY

Any captain who has not made a report as yet is urgently requested to do so on or before Saturday. Cash and pledges can be turned in at the Cascade State Bank or may be turned in at a meeting set for the captains Saturday night at 8 p.m. in the auxiliary room. Saturday night will be the final report so all captains are urged to attend.

Monday's Commercial Club meeting produced another \$500 loan when the club members voted to lend that amount.

#### ARCHITECT HERE

The committee has been informed by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation that its architect, Mr. Don F. Putney, of the Technical Service, Burlington, will be in Cascade Tuesday of next week to look at possible building sites for the Center. He will make a recommendation as to the best site available.

Final results of the drive will be announced in next week's paper.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Oct. 29, 1959]

#### MEDICAL CENTER—TEMPORARY OFFICERS, DIRECTORS ARE NAMED

A temporary slate of officers and directors has been named for the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. The group will hold office until the first annual meeting of stockholders.

R. L. Tucker has been named president; Edward Kremer, vice president; and W. T. McDermott, secretary-treasurer. Named as directors were Adrian Kurt, Ray Noonan, Dr. E. J. Bisenius, Mrs. R. L. Tucker, Richard Devaney, Mrs. Charles Schneller, Mrs. Roy Ganfield, and Leo Sullivan.

Don S. Putney, R.A., medical facilities planning consultant, Burlington, was here Monday to look at possible building sites. E. C. Whiting, medical structures consultant, Iowa City, creator of modular coordinated medical practice facilities, was here Monday evening to meet with the committee to discuss the building and construction procedure. He will return Monday evening to again meet with the board.

#### GOAL ALMOST REACHED

With almost all captains having reported in, the financial goal has been almost

reached. It is hoped all captains will be finished with their calls by Saturday night.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Nov. 5, 1959]

#### ENTER CONTRACTS—SELECT EAST SIDE LOTS FOR MEDICAL CENTER

E. C. Whiting, of Iowa City, consultant for Modular Coordinated Medical Practice Buildings, met Monday evening with the Cascade Medical Center Committee. Following a long discussion, second in 2 weeks, the committee entered into contracts with Mr. Whiting and Lyle Rogers, of Warsaw, Ill., who will act as general contractor, to erect a Modular Medical Building here. Mr. Rogers will work under the supervision of Mr. Whiting.

Two building sites were given careful study. The committee acting upon advice from both Mr. Whiting and Don S. Putney, engineer consultant, of Burlington, selected what is known as the Legion lots in East Cascade.

Mr. Whiting has been consultant to about 60 of these buildings this year. Mr. Rogers has three or four of those buildings in various stages of completion at this time.

Bids will be offered local concerns on lighting, heating, plumbing, air conditioning, and floor coverings.

Because work is starting almost immediately and at an accelerated pace, it will be necessary for stockholders to move up the date of their pledges. It is hoped that other public-spirited citizens will join in this community-wide project. Stock purchases are available through members of the committee or at Cascade State Bank.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Nov. 19, 1959]

#### MEDICAL CENTER BUILDING STARTED

Construction started last week on the Cascade Medical Center, Inc. The footings were dug Friday, and Monday the cement was poured. A picture shows the building-site after the footings were dug. The picture was taken with American Legion Post 528's park in the background. Steel for the 44-foot-5½-inch by 49-foot 5½-inch building will be shipped from Elizabeth, Ill., on November 28. Pledge reminder letters are now being mailed to stockholders so that building expenses can be met as they arise. Payments on the pledges can be returned in the return envelopes enclosed with the pledge reminders, paid at the bank, or paid to one of the center officers.

[From the Cascade (Iowa) Pioneer-Advertiser, Dec. 10, 1959]

#### MEDICAL CENTER PROGRESSING

Work on the Cascade Medical Center is rapidly progressing. Work was just starting on the steel bar joists and steel fabricated trusses Tuesday when a picture was taken. Workmen finished the steel installation yesterday (Wednesday) and now have started on the roof. A photo also shows the exterior prefabricated wall panels. Lyle Rogers, Warsaw, Ill., the general contractor, has been supervising the construction. Art Dehner is the subcontractor. Completion date is tentatively set for mid-January.

Mr. Speaker, the dedication ceremonies of this new medical center were held on April 3, 1960. As the newspaper said:

It was through the combined efforts of everyone that a dream became a reality.

Perhaps this is why on a cold, damp, raw day, almost a thousand people came to the ceremonies and viewed the medical center with shining eyes and pride in their own personal accomplishment.



The Pioneer-Advertiser on April 7, 1960, reported as follows:

This community's new medical center was dedicated with appropriate ceremonies Sunday. The weather was not 100 percent cooperative but the number of people at both the program and open house following was nothing short of tremendous. Had good weather prevailed, it is doubtful if the crowds could have been handled. It is estimated 500 people attended dedication ceremonies in Legion pavilion and no fewer than 800 viewed the center during the afternoon.

Program speakers were lavish in their praise of the medical center, as well they might be. Its exterior beauty is eye-catching. Its interior, circular in design, is novel at the same time labor-saving for the doctor. Sears-Roebuck Foundation is to be highly complimented for the features incorporated into this building. One speaker at Sunday's dedication said it compared favorably with any to be found in Chicago, New York or San Francisco. Another voiced the opinion it was comparable to any in the Nation. In both instances they were right. This entire community may take pardonable pride in this medical center. It was through the combined efforts of everyone that a dream became a reality. This medical center should prove conclusively that small communities are far from gasping for their last breath. Each community is just as good as its residents wish to make it.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication ceremonies, and the report on my remarks follows:

"If this town is dying, then I would like to be a part of it." So spoke Representative LEN WOLF at the dedication program Sunday of the Cascade Medical Center. WOLF's words were in reply to recent articles in a neighboring newspaper which implied that rural America (the small towns) was dying and would become a thing of the past.

Over 500 persons attended the dedication program and an estimated 800 visited the center during the open house which followed.

#### RURAL AMERICA ON THE GO

Representative WOLF, in his dedication address, referred to the completion of the medical center as, "Rural America in action; rural America on the go." He praised the area for its adjustment to changing times and its ability to get things done by the action of its own people.

"It's easy to write to Congressmen in Washington," WOLF said, "and say we need help, but first you must prove that you can help yourself. This has been done here in Cascade and community."

Speaking on "Community Relations and Medical Care" WOLF concluded his address with, "God bless you for the work you've done, I'm proud to be a part of you today."

#### TUCKER MASTER OF CEREMONIES

R. L. Tucker, president of the board of directors of the medical center, turned in an excellent job as master of ceremonies at the formal program.

The Reverend Thomas Bisenius, chaplain of Post 528 and assistant pastor at St. Lucas, offered the invocation.

Several distinguished guests were introduced including Mayor Leo Hirtz, Bernard; Mayor William Mausser, Epworth; Mayor Cliff Knippel, Dyersville; Mayor Leo Dolphin, Cascade; and E. C. Whiting, consultant for the center project.

Dr. Robert Myers, president of the Jones County Medical Society, was present representing the society. He congratulated the Cascade area on the completion of its fine center and extended best wishes to Dr. Mehrl as he started practice in Cascade. "From my own experiences," Dr. Myers said, "You couldn't have picked a better town."

#### DAVIS SPOKE

Norman Davis, director of medical programs for the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, extended his congratulations for the rapid completion of one of the best medical centers in the United States. "This medical facility could be put in any size city in the country and would rank at the very top," Davis told his audience. He presented a plaque to the center from the foundation in recognition of the project's completion.

Aslam Zafar, in this country from Pakistan to study Democratic policies and agricultural practices, accompanied WOLF from Washington and spoke briefly. Zafar has been assigned to WOLF because of the latter's interest in agriculture.

Dr. William J. Mehrl, who started practices in the center Monday, expressed his gratitude for the help and kindnesses that had been extended to him and his family since they moved to Cascade the previous Thursday. Dr. Mehrl said they are looking forward to living in Cascade and becoming a part of the community. He also announced that Elizabeth Carr, R.N., would be the nurse at the center. Later, he officiated at the ribbon-cutting ceremony at the center.

#### LEGION COLOR GUARD

Personnel from Cascade American Legion Post 528 comprised the color guard. Making up the guard were Jerry Green, Pat Kean, Dave Dolphin, Herb Green, and Dick Sullivan.

The Dubuque American Legion Drum and Bugle Corps provided the days musical entertainment.

The Cascade Women's Club served coffee and cookies during the open house at the center.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this presentation of Cascade's accomplishments will show other communities which are faced with similar difficulties that they can cause miracles to happen through their own concerted efforts.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for May 23 and 24, on account of attending United Nations sessions in New York City.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 20 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. QUITE), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, May 25.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. SISK and to include a speech by Mr. WOLF.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. BOSCH.

Mr. ALGER.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

Mr. FOGARTY in three instances.

(At the request of Mr. QUITE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proportion of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals); and

H.R. 9308. An act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 44. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2171. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting 36 reports covering 49 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled, "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(1)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2172. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to change the method of promotion of Reserve officers of the Air Force to Reserve general officer grades"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2173. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for \$50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2174. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 51st quarterly report, covering the 1st quarter 1960, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2175. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to the act of Congress approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 599), and as amended by the act approved July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 173); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2176. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the initial report on the review of the administrative management of the ballistic missile program of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2177. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the automatic data-processing (ADP) installation, New Orleans commodity office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, October 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2178. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1960, the following bills were reported on May 20, 1960:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12326. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12261. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 23, 1960]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 9883. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Sixteenth report of the Com-

mittee on Government Operations; (Rept. No. 1637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9996. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to prescribe procedures to insure that foreign excess property which is disposed of overseas will not be imported into the United States to the injury of the economy of this country; with amendment (Rept. No. 1638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9866. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11615. A bill to amend section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12176. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 536. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10128, a bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1643). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11854. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1960, the following bill was introduced May 20, 1960:

By Mr. CANNON:  
H.R. 12326. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred May 23, 1960]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:  
H.R. 12327. A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARDEN:  
H.R. 12328. A bill to extend and improve the special education and rehabilitation services provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BETTS:  
H.R. 12329. A bill relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishments

of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:  
H.R. 12330. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:  
H.R. 12331. A bill for recovery by the United States of costs and expenses to it arising out of the negligent or wrongful acts of third persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:  
H.R. 12332. A bill to establish an Arms Control Research Institute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:  
H.R. 12333. A bill to extend to nonprofit sport fishing or fishing fair or contest organizations and associations the third-class mail rates applicable to certain categories of nonprofit organizations or associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:  
H.R. 12334. A bill to decelerate depreciation of income of cotton producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY:  
H.R. 12335. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12336. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12337. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations from certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:  
H.R. 12338. A bill to amend certain laws of the United States in order to abolish the death penalty, and to substitute in lieu thereof life imprisonment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:  
H.R. 12339. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12340. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations from certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAUND:  
H.R. 12341. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:  
H.R. 12342. A bill to provide for the erection of Freedom Monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:  
H.R. 12343. A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:  
H.R. 12344. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the procurement of



property and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12345. A bill to require the use of competitive bidding to the maximum practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces through the establishment of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 12346. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 12347. A bill to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12348. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12349. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.J. Res. 711. Joint resolution designating the red and white carnation and the blue cornflower as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the death penalty under the laws of the United States, any State, or any other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 713. Joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Con. Res. 692. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 693. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 694. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. Res. 537. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9883, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 12350. A bill for the relief of Marion John Nagurski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 12351. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Forrest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 12352. A bill for the relief of Marta Manelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 12353. A bill for the relief of Edgar Allen Gallegos and Ana Gloria Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12354. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 12355. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 12356. A bill for the relief of Masaki and Yaeko Ouchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 538. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 4426, with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a system of payments by the Federal Government to the State of Nevada or its local governments, which payments will be made in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property in this State, which property is immune from State or local taxation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose constitutional amendment abolishing income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the Federal Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as provided in the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose passage of H.R. 1884, which if enacted will prohibit the States from imposing a length-of-residence requirement as a condition to receiving welfare benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

470. By Mr. HARMON: Petition of Harold J. Crowley, Shelbyville, Ind., and 16 others, opposing the enactment of H.R. 10033; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

471. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Fluhrer, president, Machine, Tool & Die Local 155, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting and requesting enactment of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Washington Report

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 21, 1960:

#### WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 21, 1960)

Future historical analysis of the summit may record that President Eisenhower's conduct scored a great victory for the free

world. Meanwhile, we can all be "Monday morning quarterbacks." We all can expect, also, the bitterest, least-temperate appraisals to come from politically motivated office-seekers. At the moment, the nicely staged show of bipartisan support represented by the Democrat leadership's message to Ike at the summit has been rudely shattered by presidential-aspirant Stevenson's sharp attack on Eisenhower's administration. A spirit of constructive criticism would be more apparent if Mr. Stevenson had not alleged that it will take a Democrat administration and himself to do the job. Of course, we all know each person's evaluation of himself is high. That's human. But it's another thing to suggest against the background of the Yalta, Potsdam and Teheran Conferences that a Democrat administration can better handle or solve foreign problems.

Health care for the aged continues as the focal point of the social security bill being prepared for House debate. A move to hold

hearings to get further information was defeated. To me it is inconceivable that a right solution can come from ignorance of the facts. We still have no comprehensive knowledge of medical services available or of medical needs and how they are being met, since we lack information on State and local programs. All we have, as data, is Health, Education, and Welfare Department information on Federal programs, which are only a part and not the major part at that. In my view, this is not responsible conduct, neither to other Members of Congress who look to the Ways and Means Committee for guidance in this field nor to the people of the Nation, including the aged and all taxpayers. Fortunately, the final page of this story has yet to be written. I hope politics will not dictate it.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1960 expands the Federal effort to make equity type capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns. We thus add to the Federal bureaucracy and